ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 6/3/65 | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER: ED000679

2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: 8123

3. IDENTIFICATION NO.:

4. AUTHOR(S): California Department of Finance

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Projection of Enrollment for California's Institutions of Higher Education 1960-75

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. State Dept. of Finance
CITY Sacramento, Cal.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: California: State Department of Finance

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	60	102

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA:

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (8-12)

higher edu.	development	students		
surveys	enrollments			
planning	administration			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

These projections were prepared for the master plan survey team and the liaison committee of the regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education. One of the functions of the master plan survey has been to examine enrollment growth in California's institutions of higher education and to determine what policies should be initiated to guide and modify the projected enrollments. In order to do this, the survey team has followed the three-step program which is covered in this report: The examination of enrollment projections showing numerical growth if present trends continue to 1975; the statement of policies designed to modify these trends; and the presentation of modified enrollment projections seeking to reflect the effect of the master plan upon the number, type, and distribution of college students in California.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT: Reporter No. 6

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION:

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.:

21. CONTRACT NO.:

PROJECT NO.:

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT:

23. DURATION OR PROJECT:

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

#6

R-6-17.

8123

Projections of Enrollment for California's Institutions of Higher Education 1960-1975

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED000679

PROJECTIONS OF ENROLLMENT FOR CALIFORNIA'S INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
1960-1975

Prepared for the Master Plan Survey Team and the
Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University
of California and the State Board of Education

Arthur G. Coons, Chairman
Arthur D. Browne
Howard A. Campion
Glenn S. Dumke
Thomas C. Holy
Dean E. McHenry
Henry T. Tyler
Robert J. Wert

By the

California Department of Finance

Staff:

Carl M. Frisen
Joseph M. Freitas
Evelyn S. Guttmann
Walter P. Hollmann
Gladys M. Stone

With the Assistance of the

Advisory Committee on Enrollment Projections

Carl M. Frisen, Chairman
Algeo G. Brill
Lowell H. Dunigan
Clyde P. Fisher
Robert S. Johnson
Donovan E. Smith
John E. Steinbaugh
Elliott J. Taylor
Henry T. Tyler

Sacramento

October, 1960

JOHN E. CARR
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

EDMUND G. BROWN
GOVERNOR

T. H. MUGFORD
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Department of Finance
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO 14

October 4, 1960

Arthur G. Coons, Chairman
Master Plan Survey Team and
President, Occidental College
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles 41, California

Dear Dr. Coons:

On May 20, 1959, in anticipation of the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 88 requesting the development of a Master Plan for higher education in California, Roy E. Simpson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, asked the Department of Finance to undertake the responsibility for:

> "(a) a re-examination of the current enrollment projections, together with their distribution among the four segments of higher education in California; and (b) their extension until at least 1975."

The Director of Finance authorized the Financial and Population Research Section of the Budget Division to comply with this request, and there is transmitted herewith the final report of the Department of Finance on Projections of Enrollment in California's Institutions of Higher Education, 1960-75.

At the outset of the study the Department indicated a desire to have an Advisory Committee whose members could assist in establishing basic definitions and examining problems of a technical nature. Representing all segments of higher education, the committee designated by Dr. Kerr and Dr. Simpson includes:

Algeo G. Brill - Assistant to the President, Yuba College, Marysville
Lowell H. Dunigan - Administrative Planning Office, Division of State Colleges, State Department of Education, Sacramento
Clyde P. Fisher - Dean of the College, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo
Robert S. Johnson - Office of the President, University of California, Berkeley
Donovan E. Smith - Specialist in Physical Planning, Office of Architects and Engineers, University of California, Berkeley
John E. Steinbaugh - Director of Admissions, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
Elliott J. Taylor - Director of Admissions, College of the Pacific, Stockton
Henry T. Tyler - Executive Secretary, California Junior College Assn., 1329 Fordham Avenue, Modesto

Through their specialized knowledge and experience, the committee members contributed materially to the initial definition of the study and the mode of approach. Their assistance is greatly appreciated. However, the projections presented in this report are the full responsibility of the Department of Finance staff, which made the final decisions regarding assumptions to be adopted and methods to be utilized.

A major portion of this report is devoted to a discussion of the assumed impact of Master Plan recommendations on California's college enrollments. This section of the study necessitated projecting the general nature of the administrative procedures which might be used to implement the recommendations, coordinating them so that each system of higher education would participate and at the same time maintaining the proposed inter-system balance. Some of the complexities that must be faced in actually putting the Master Plan into operation are illustrated by comparing the assumptions in Chapter IV with the comments in Appendix D, which present alternative assumptions for the University of California as submitted by its representatives on the Advisory Committee.

With the preparation of this report the Department of Finance hopes that it has satisfactorily discharged its responsibility as defined at the start of the Master Plan study. In concluding, special thanks are extended to the many persons in all systems of higher education who willingly provided information and assistance throughout the course of this project.

Sincerely,

CMF

Carl M. Frisén
Senior Research Technician
for Population Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section — Page

I. Introduction 1

Definition of Terms 3

II. The *Status Quo* Projections of Enrollment 6

The Major Assumptions 6
Trends of Growth in Public Education in California . 7
Trends of Growth in California's Systems of Higher Education 9
Trends of Growth of the State Colleges and University Campuses 10

III. The Relationship of Master Plan Recommendations to *Modified* Projections of Full-Time Enrollment . . . 13

General Assumptions Underlying both *Status Quo* and *Modified* Enrollments 15
General Assumptions Modified by Master Plan Recommendations Related to Other Objectives . . . 16
Assumptions Underlying the Redistribution of Lower Division Students 21

IV. The *Modified* Projections of Enrollment 27

Appendix

A. Institutions of Higher Education Included in the Master Plan Enrollment Projections 41

B. The *Status Quo* Enrollment Projections 51

C. Sources of Data 83

D. Statement by the members of the Advisory Committee representing the University of California 91

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

Text Tables

1. Enrollment Gains in California's Public System of Education by Level, Fall, 1955 to Fall, 1975 8

2. Distribution of Full-Time Enrollment within California's Systems of Higher Education, Fall, 1958 and Fall, 1975 . . 11

3. Gains in Full-Time Graded Enrollment, California's Systems of Higher Education, by Level, Fall, 1958 to Fall, 1975. . 11

4. Comparison of 1975 Status Quo Enrollments with Planning Figures, California State Colleges Full-Time Students Only 22

5. Comparison of 1975 Status Quo Enrollments with Planning Figures, University of California Full-Time Students Only 23

6. Status Quo and Modified Projections of Full-Time Enrollment, State Colleges and University of California, Fall, 1975. . 28

7. Rate of Growth in Full-Time Lower Division Enrollment by Segment Status Quo and Modified Projections, 1958 to 1975 29

8. Percentage Distribution of Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment by Level, State Colleges and University of California - 1975 Modified Projections 29

Modified Projections

M1. Summary of Modified Projections of Full-Time Enrollment of California Institutions of Higher Learning Included in the Master Plan Survey, by Type of Institution, to 1975 32

M2. Modified Projections of Fall Full-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of College Location, California Public Junior Colleges, to 1975 33

M3. Modified Projections of Fall Full-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of College Location and Class Level, California State Colleges, to 1975 35

M4. Modified Projections of Fall Graded Enrollment by State Economic Area of Campus Location and Class Level, University of California, to 1975 38

Table Page

Status Quo Projections
(Appendix B)

HS1. Reported and Projected Public High School Graduates by State Economic Area 53

TC1. Summary of First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Total Enrollment of California Institutions of Higher Learning Included in the Master Plan Survey, by Type of Institution, to 1975 54

TC2. Summary of First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Full-Time Enrollment of California Institutions of Higher Learning Included in the Master Plan Survey, by Type of Institution, to 1975 55

TC3. Summary of First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Part-Time Enrollment of California Institutions of Higher Learning Included in the Master Plan Survey, by Type of Institution, to 1975 56

JC1. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Enrollment, Full-Time and Part-Time, California Public Junior Colleges, to 1975 57

JC2. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Full-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of College Location, California Public Junior Colleges, to 1975. 58

JC3. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Part-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of College Location, California Public Junior Colleges, to 1975. 60

SC1. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Enrollment, Full-Time and Part-Time, by Class Level, California State Colleges, California, to 1975 62

SC2. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Full-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of College Location and Class Level, California State Colleges, to 1975. . . 63

SC3. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Part-time Enrollment by State Economic Area of College Location and Class Level, California State Colleges, to 1975. . . 67

UC1. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Enrollment by Class Level, University of California, to 1975 . . . 71

UC2. First-Run "Status Quo" Projection of Fall Graded Enrollment by State Economic Area of Campus Location and Class Level, University of California, to 1975 . . . 72

Table | Page

UC3. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Special Enrollment by State Economic Area of Campus Location, University of California, to 1975 74

IC1. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Enrollment, Full-Time and Part-Time, by Class Level, Independent Colleges, California, to 1975 75

IC2. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Full-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of Location and Class Level, Independent Colleges, California, to 1975 76

IC3. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Part-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of Location and Class Level, Independent Colleges, California, to 1975 78

IU1. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Enrollment Full-Time and Part-Time, by Class Level, Independent Universities and Equivalent Institutions, California, to 1975 80

IU2. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Full-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of Location and Class Level, Independent Universities and Equivalent Institutions, California, to 1975 81

IU3. First-Run "Status Quo" Projections of Fall Part-Time Enrollment by State Economic Area of Location and Class Level, Independent Universities and Equivalent Institutions, California, to 1975 82

PROJECTIONS OF ENROLLMENT FOR CALIFORNIA'S INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Section I

INTRODUCTION

One of the functions of the Master Plan Survey[1] has been to examine enrollment growth in California's institutions of higher education and to determine what policies should be initiated to guide and modify the projected enrollments. In order to do this, the Survey Team has followed a three-step program involving:

1. the examination of enrollment projections showing numerical growth if present trends continue to 1975;
2. the statement of policies designed to modify these trends in terms of the over-all objectives of the Master Plan ; and
3. the presentation of modified enrollment projections seeking to reflect the effect of the Master Plan upon the numbers, type and distribution of college students in California.

The basis for this approach lies in a recognition of need for a statement of potential enrollments as a prerequisite to policy determination. Therefore, the first step in this phase of the Master Plan Study was to prepare a set of projections which assumes a continuation of present admission and retention policies and also of the present pattern of student choice of the system and institution of attendance.

It should be realized that status quo projections are not limited to the physical capacities of specific college or university sites. These projections show, for example, 1975 enrollments of approximately 44,000 at the Berkeley campus of the University of California and 25,000 at San Jose State College.

---

[1] The origin and scope of the Survey are described in Chapter II of: Master Plan Survey Team, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975, (Berkeley and Sacramento, 1960). See especially the section on "Problems to be Studied."

No effort has been made to determine whether or not these campuses could be expanded to handle such large enrollments, because the essential function of status quo projections is to measure the size of enrollments in 1975 if California's high school graduates continue to attend institutions in line with the present trends of choice. Once measured in this way, the resulting enrollment figures can serve as a basis for analysis. They are a working tool in the decision-making process, because they direct attention to the dimension of future enrollment growth under a given set of conditions and raise a question concerning the program of action best suited to cope with the expected enrollment changes. The role of the status quo projections, then, is to describe the relative rates of growth of the major systems of higher education, as well as to portray institutional differences in college attendance and geographic variations in sources of students. With these data available, the Survey Team was in a position to take the second step, that is, to frame recommendations for a "program of action" that might serve to coordinate the use of present facilities and the development of new ones within the over-all perspective of the Master Plan.

The major recommendations of the Master Plan Survey which affect status quo enrollment trends are stated generally, as broad objectives or goals. As a result, the administrative policies required to implement these general objectives--rather than the objectives themselves--will determine their impact on the distribution of future enrollments among institutions and systems. To prepare the modified enrollment projections called for in the third step of the Master Plan program, it was necessary to assume certain types of hypothetical administrative policies, in the light of the broad program of control recommended in the Master Plan Survey. The basic Master Plan recommendations and the assumed administrative policies are described in Section III.

It should be recognized at the outset that the formulation of a detailed program of action is the result of a series of specific choices from many possible alternatives. The modified projections as described in Section IV should, therefore, be interpreted as a valid projection of the effect of the Master Plan recommendations only to the degree that these assumed administrative policies may become operative.

Definition of Terms

The types of questions to be answered by the Master Plan Survey determined the system of classification used in preparing the enrollment projections. Data were required for the number of students distributed by:

1. full-time and part-time status;
2. lower division, upper division, graduate and special levels of enrollment;
3. geographic area of origin; and
4. type of institution attended.

Brief comments on each of these categories follow. In some cases, reference is made to more detailed information presented in the appendices of this report.

Full-time and part-time status of students. The status quo tables in Appendix B present total enrollment, full-time enrollment and part-time enrollment in each system of higher education. In general, it is assumed that the full-time enrollment figures reported by the various institutions represent the students taking twelve or more units of credit. In the case of the University of California the "graded" enrollment was used in place of specific reporting of students by units of credit. It is assumed that the number of students identified in relation to freshman, sophomore, junior, senior and graduate status provides a close approximation of actual full-time enrollment at the University.

State college enrollment involves three categories: full-time, representing students enrolled for twelve or more units; part-time regular, representing students taking more than six but fewer than twelve units; and limited students, or those registered for six or fewer units of credit. The total part-time enrollment for the state colleges comprises the part-time regular students, classified by instructional levels, and the limited students, who are not so classified.

Levels of enrollment of students. College students are classified as lower division, upper division, or graduate, depending upon the classificatory scheme used by the institutions in preparing official reports. It is assumed that lower division includes all freshman and sophomore students, while upper division comprises the junior and senior students. Graduate students are those who have received a baccalaureate degree.

All students not reported in graded status within these three levels are considered special students. This category includes all students indicated as being special, unclassified, or limited.

Geographic areas of origin and college attendance. The origins and destinations of college students must be stated in geographic terms, and for this purpose the State economic areas as defined by the Bureau of the Census have been adopted. A detailed description of the definition and criteria used in setting up these areas is presented in State Economic Areas by Donald J. Bogue, published by the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, in 1951.

At the present time there are ten standard metropolitan statistical areas in the State, covering the major urban centers of the State. There are also nine non-metropolitan areas comprising the remainder of the State's fifty-eight counties.

The list of counties and areas shown on page 5 has been adjusted for new standard metropolitan statistical areas defined by the Federal Bureau of the Budget as of January 1, 1960.

Types of institutions of higher education. The enrollment projections show expected gains within four systems of higher education in the State: the public junior colleges, the State colleges, the University of California, and independent institutions, which are further classified as independent colleges and independent universities. Appendix A lists all of the institutions of higher education included in these projections by system and by State economic area of location. This list is derived from Education Directory, 1958-59, Part 3, "Higher Education," published by the United States Office of Education. Exceptions to this list in the analysis are described in Appendix A, together with year to year shifts in institutions reported. The latter indicate the dynamic nature of higher education in California.

The sources of data used in the preparation of these enrollment projections are described in Appendix C. Included is a copy of the questionnaire used to obtain enrollment projections from the independent colleges and universities. While there was some editing of these projections, involving a few modifications and additions where data were missing or incomplete, the totals shown for the independent institutions are essentially the figures based on each institution's planning and analysis.

Section II

THE STATUS QUO PROJECTIONS OF ENROLLMENT

This section presents the basic assumptions underlying the status quo projections and the resulting trends of growth which under these circumstances could be expected in California's system of public education, its system of higher education, and more specifically its publicly controlled institutions.

The Major Assumptions

As has already been noted, the status quo projections are based on a series of assumptions that involve little or no change from present policies and patterns. The major assumptions controlling the projections are:

1. The State of California will continue to grow rapidly, reflecting a high level of State and national economic development without any major economic setbacks, atomic wars or natural catastrophes between now and 1975. By that time the State's total population is expected to approximate twenty-five million persons.
2. The rates at which children remain in high school until graduation and the geographic distribution of high school graduates to 1975 will generally follow the trends of the past decade.
3. The rates at which California's young people enter its colleges will continue present trends and show a gradual increase to 1975.
4. The independent colleges and universities cannot or will not expand their facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain their present proportion of enrollment.
5. The publicly controlled facilities will be limited to institutions in operation and reporting enrollments in the fall of 1958, with the addition of two public junior colleges (Cabrillo College and College of the Desert), four new State colleges (Alameda County, Orange County, North Bay and Stanislaus County) and three new campuses of the University of California

(La Jolla, Southeast Los Angeles and South Central Coast).

6. Each publicly controlled institution within each system will continue to attract students at about present rates and students will continue current patterns of place of origin and attendance, except as modified by the new institutions. Implicit is a continuation of present admission policies, curricula and other conditions influencing enrollment.
7. Each institution will be able to accommodate all the students who would enroll under these assumptions, so that the projected enrollments are "potentials" not restricted by site, physical plant or other limitations that may actually exist.

The status quo nature of these assumptions is dictated by the role that the projections are designed to play as the first step in the study of "the problem of numbers" by the Master Plan Survey Team. Their function is to emphasize the points at which policies incorporated into the Master Plan should be applied if they are to achieve desired enrollment shifts between and within the systems of publicly controlled higher education. The recommendations of the Survey Team, as they apply to the direction and control of enrollment, are based upon an examination of the implications of these projections.

Trends of Growth in Public Education in California

In order to provide a wider perspective, one may compare expected gains in the numbers of college students with the growth of the State's public elementary and high school enrollments. Table 1 summarizes information on the three levels of public education from 1955 to 1975. The figures showing change by five-year intervals serve to trace the peak of the current "wave" of youngsters through the various levels of school and college. The increase in elementary enrollment was greatest during 1955-60; the next five years will bring the largest gains in the high school grades; and the colleges will reach their peak of growth between 1965 and 1970.

Table 1. ENROLLMENT GAINS IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC SYSTEM OF EDUCATION BY LEVEL, FALL, 1955 TO FALL, 1975
(Collegiate enrollment includes University of California, State colleges and junior colleges. Adult enrollment excluded.)

	Level of public education			
Year (fall)	Elementary	High School	Collegiate	Total
Number of students:				
1955	1,916,668	531,362	190,380	2,638,410
1960	2,577,000	805,700	348,300	3,731,000
1965	3,186,200	1,112,600	545,450	4,844,250
1970	3,742,900	1,381,800	745,700	5,870,400
1975	4,256,500	1,633,800	934,100	6,824,400
Percentage distribution:				
1955	72.7%	20.1%	7.2%	100.0%
1960	69.1	21.6	9.3	100.0
1965	65.8	23.0	11.2	100.0
1970	63.8	23.5	12.7	100.0
1975	62.4	23.9	13.7	100.0
Five-year change:				
1955-60	660,300	274,300	157,900	1,092,500
1960-65	609,200	306,900	197,150	1,113,250
1965-70	556,700	269,200	200,250	1,026,150
1970-75	513,600	252,000	188,400	954,000

The most recent reported enrollment figures used in this study are for the fall of 1958 and at that time the grand total of students (excluding those classified as "adults") in California's public elementary, high school and collegiate facilities was 3,265,000. By the fall of 1975, if present trends continue, this total is expected to reach 6,824,000, representing an over-all total of 3,559,000 additional students. In terms of levels of public education, this means that for every 100 students at each level in the fall of 1958, the 1975 enrollments will show:

186 elementary school pupils;
233 high school pupils; and
344 college students.

These projections emphasize the extent to which the over-all "problem of numbers" will become more acute at higher education levels in the years ahead.

Trends of Growth in California's Systems of Higher Education

Total enrollments in all institutions of higher learning in California were reported as 336,000 in fall, 1958, and are projected as 1,036,000 in fall, 1975.[1] Comparable figures for full-time students only are 226,000 in 1958 and 661,000 in 1975. Of the total enrollment gain of 700,000 students, it is anticipated that the publicly controlled systems will absorb 663,000, or 95 per cent. Similarly, 409,000, or 94 per cent, of the additional 436,000 full-time students will enroll at public facilities.

The *status quo* assumptions show that, for every 100 full-time students now enrolled in each system of higher education, in the fall of 1975 there will be:

276 students in public junior colleges;
449 students in State colleges;
316 students in the University of California;
186 students in independent colleges; and
120 students in independent universities.

---

[1] Enrollment figures are rounded to the nearest thousand in the text; detailed data are presented in the tables in Appendix B.

As a result of these differences in rates of growth, significant shifts will occur in the proportions of full-time students enrolled in each system. Table 2 compares the figures for 1958 and 1975. Of particular interest are the percentage changes which may be expected within the publicly controlled systems if present trends continue.

Because the junior college system is limited to lower division work, it may be useful to compare enrollment gains at this level only. The data are included in Table 3. Although the State's public junior colleges will receive 60 per cent of the lower division gains within the publicly controlled systems, their rate of growth will be the slowest of the three segments.

In terms of the over-all pattern of lower division full-time enrollment, the fall of 1975 should show, for every 100 students now enrolled in each system:

276 students in public junior colleges;
458 students in State colleges;
327 students in the University of California;
186 students in independent colleges; and
112 students in independent universities.

Table 3 also indicates what a continuation of current trends will mean in terms of upper division and graduate gains to 1975 in each system. It would appear that at present there is no persistent operative policy of emphasis on upper division and graduate enrollment expansion within either the State college or University of California systems. Under status quo assumptions, both systems will record their highest rates of growth at the lower division level.

Trends of Growth of the State Colleges and University Campuses

The enrollment gains between now and 1975 offer a further basis for analysis if they are examined in terms of the institutions which would be expected to handle them. Thus, the twelve State colleges operating in the fall of 1958 reported full-time enrollments ranging from 987 to 9,035 students, while the 1975 projections for these same colleges vary from 4,300 to 28,550. The five

Table 2. DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT WITHIN CALIFORNIA'S SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FALL, 1958 AND FALL, 1975

System and control	Fall, 1958		Fall, 1975	
	No. of students	Percentage distribution	No. of students	Percentage distribution
All systems:				
Public	178,791	79.2%	587,400	88.8%
Independent	46,824	20.8	73,950	11.2
Total	225,615	100.0	661,350	100.0
Publicly controlled:				
Junior college	91,162	51.0	251,400	42.8
State college	44,528	24.9	200,000	34.0
Univ. of Calif.	43,101	24.1	136,000	23.2
Total	178,791	100.0	587,400	100.0

* * *

Table 3. GAINS IN FULL-TIME GRADED ENROLLMENT, CALIFORNIA'S SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, BY LEVEL, FALL, 1958 TO FALL, 1975

System and control	Fall 1958	Fall 1975	1958-75 change	
			Number	Percent
Publicly controlled:				
Junior college				
Lower division	89,206	246,350	157,150	176.2%
State college				
Lower division	20,052	91,750	71,700	357.6
Upper division	21,701	96,300	74,600	343.8
Graduate	2,681	11,950	9,250	345.7
University of California				
Lower division	14,030	45,900	31,850	227.2
Upper division	16,149	50,450	34,300	212.4
Graduate	12,922	39,650	26,750	206.8
Independently controlled:				
College				
Lower division	14,766	27,500	12,750	86.2
Upper division	9,520	17,100	7,600	79.6
Graduate	1,851	4,300	2,450	132.3
University				
Lower division	6,026	6,750	700	12.0
Upper division	7,654	8,450	800	10.4
Graduate	4,792	7,100	2,300	48.2
All systems:				
Public	176,741	582,350	405,600	229.5
Independent	44,609	71,200	26,600	59.6
Total	221,350	653,550	432,200	195.3

University of California campuses, which enrolled from 991 to 19,198 full-time students in 1958, are expected to have from 7,050 to 43,950 students in 1975, assuming that facilities can be provided. In addition, four new State colleges and three new University campuses will enroll from 3,250 to 16,950 students.

Tables 4 and 5 permit a comparison of State college and University full-time enrollments for 1958 and 1975, and also show recommended _planning figure_ enrollments recommended by the Department of Education and the University of California, respectively. The planning figures are included to provide an approximate measure of the degree to which the _status quo_ projections may exceed maximum enrollments currently considered feasible in terms of site capacities and administrative planning. Four State colleges and three campuses of the University of California included in this analysis will have passed their maximum enrollments by 1975 if the planning figures are used as a measure.

This section has outlined the _status quo_ pattern of enrollment growth in the State and has brought together information from the basic tables on the 1958-75 gains by systems and by individual State colleges and University campuses.

Section III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS TO MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT

With the _status quo_ projections available, the Survey Team was in a position to carry out the first step of its program: an examination of enrollment growth if present trends continue to 1975. This analysis, in turn, led to the second step in which the Team was called upon to formulate a statement of policies designed to modify these trends in terms of the over-all objectives of the Master Plan.

The Survey Team registered its primary concern over two aspects of the _status quo_ pattern. First, the Team noted that the public junior colleges would enroll a proportionately smaller share of the total number of students in 1975 and would also show a slower rate of growth than the lower divisions of the State college and University systems (Tables 2 and 3). Second, it was apparent that enrollment potentials for some institutions would far exceed capacities as defined in terms of site and other limitations, while other institutions might well be in a position to accommodate larger numbers than would enroll at them under _status quo_ assumptions (Tables 4 and 5).

Consideration of these and other possible developments resulted in the Master Plan recommendation that:

> In order to implement more fully the action of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education in 1955 that "the University of California emphasize policies leading to the reduction of lower division enrollments in relation to those of the upper and graduate divisions, and that the state colleges pursue policies which have a similar effect," the percentage of undergraduates in the lower division of both the state colleges and the University be gradually decreased ten percentage points below that existing in 1960 (estimated to be 51 per cent in both segments) by 1975. It is further recommended that the determination of the means by which this recommendation can best be carried out, be the responsibility of the governing boards.
>
> (Footnote) It is estimated that the foregoing recommendation would result in the transfer of some 40,000 lower division students to the

> junior colleges by 1975. It is expected that the recommendation to select state college students from the upper 33 1/3 per cent of all public high school graduates and the University from the upper 12 1/2 per cent, together with the recommendation that all "limited" students be required to meet regular admission requirements, will make up the other 10,000.[1]

In brief, this recommendation describes an objective — eventual reduction by ten percentage points in the proportion of full-time undergraduate students[2] enrolled in the lower division of the State college and University systems — and it implies that this will be accomplished through a diversion of students to the public junior colleges, but it provides no explicit formulation of policy as a guide to achieving this goal. The administrative means required to activate this recommendation are left to the determination of the governing boards and the administrators within each system.

It soon became evident in the preparation of enrollment projections intended to reflect the effect of the Master Plan on the educational systems, and particularly on the individual institutions and campuses within them, that it was necessary to assume certain administrative policies to achieve the desired ratios. These assumed policies had to be reasonable representations of the type of policies which might be adopted by the responsible authorities of each segment. At the same time they should unite the three segments into a unified pattern of administrative action of the type likely to be used in achieving the proposed objectives of the Master Plan. These two criteria should be applied in evaluating the specific assumptions described below, for the modified enrollment projections presented herein are meaningful only to the extent that their basic assumptions approximate future administrative decisions and action.

The modified projections represent enrollment trends as originally expressed in the status quo figures with modifications introduced to reflect the impact of Master Plan recommendations, both those intended to alter enrollments directly and those which indirectly affect them. The basic assumptions are, therefore, outlined in three groups: first, those general assumptions already stated as underlying the status quo projections that will continue to apply to the revision; second, recommendations of the Master Plan that are related to other objectives (such as admission policies) but may also have an effect on the future numbers of students; and third, the recommendation of the Master Plan designed to influence enrollment directly.

---

[1] Master Plan Survey Team, op. cit., p. 6

[2] Although not explicitly mentioned in the recommendation, full-time enrollment only was considered in the discussions leading to this recommendation and in formulation of the modified projections. In the remainder of this report, all references to students and to enrollment involve full-time students only, unless otherwise stated.

General Assumptions Underlying both Status Quo and Modified Enrollments

It is important to look again at the major assumptions set down in Section II as controlling the status quo projections and to have clearly in mind those in which changes have been made in accordance with Master Plan recommendations. The following assumptions underlie both sets of enrollment projections:

1. The State of California will continue to grow rapidly, reflecting a high level of State and national economic development without any major economic setbacks, atomic wars or natural catastrophes before 1975. By that time the State's total population is expected to approximate twenty-five million persons.
2. The rates at which children remain in high school until graduation and the geographic distribution of high school graduates to 1975 will generally follow the trends of the past decade.

The volume of California's population growth and its geographic distribution in the years ahead will be important determinants of future growth in college enrollments, particularly as expressed in the numbers of high school graduates. With relatively few exceptions, the first-time freshmen enrolling in academic programs at California's institutions of higher education have graduated from high school.[3] Therefore, the relationship of the number and location of high school graduates to the type and location of college facilities is basic to the rates of growth of the systems and their component units. On a Statewide basis, the number of first-time freshmen entering collegiate institutions each fall is fifty per cent or more of the prior school year's high school graduates. Projections of public high school graduates by areas, as shown in Appendix B, Table HS 1, incorporate the first two assumptions in this section and serve as the bases for the application of the following assumption:

3. The rates at which California's young people enter its colleges will continue to show a gradual increase to 1975.

Underlying this assumption is the expected combined effect of continued emphasis on the value of college training and the establishment of new facilities in each of the publicly controlled systems of higher education, with corresponding greater convenience in obtaining a college education at minimum personal cost. This trend will pose problems for public higher education, which will become even more acute because:

4. The independent colleges and universities cannot or will not expand their facilities at a rate sufficient to maintain their present proportion of enrollment.

This assumption is based on an analysis of the enrollment projections prepared by individual institutions and summarized in Tables 2 and 3. To the extent that these projections represent plans for maximum expansion by the independent colleges and universities of the State, they show the proportion of full-time students enrolled in these institutions declining from 20.8 per cent in 1958 to 11.2 per cent in 1975. There is no provision in these projections for institutions which may be established in the future, but it is improbable that any new facilities would have significant impact on the over-all total enrollments within the time span covered in this study.

---

[3] Perhaps the only major exception is found in the terminal-vocational programs of the public junior college system, where a significant number of full-time students may be enrolled without the prerequisite of a high school diploma or its equivalent.

General Assumptions Modified by Master Plan Recommendations Related to Other Objectives

The four assumptions previously identified in this section apply to both the status quo and the modified enrollment projections. The following three assumptions are restatements in the light of Master Plan recommendations of certain assumptions identified in Section II as basic to the status quo figures:

5. The publicly controlled facilities will be limited to institutions in operation and reporting enrollment in the fall of 1958, with the addition of two junior colleges (Cabrillo College and College of the Desert), six new State colleges (Alameda County, Orange County, San Bernardino County, North Bay, Southwest Los Angeles and Stanislaus County) and three new campuses of the University of California (La Jolla, South Central Coast and Southeast Los Angeles).

The only change in this statement is the addition of two more State colleges to the four new ones already included in the status quo assumption. In accordance with a Master Plan recommendation that San Bernardino County and Southwest Los Angeles State colleges should be established and in operation by 1965, enrollment projections have been revised to account for these probable actions.[4]

6. Each publicly controlled institution within each system will continue to attract students at about present rates and students will continue current patterns of place of origin and attendance except as modified by: first, the establishment of new institutions; second, the implementation of changes in admission and retention policies as recommended in the Master Plan; and third, by the application of enrollment limitations at individual colleges and campuses.

---

[4] The projected enrollments for these institutions are included in Table M3, and are based on the assumptions sketched in this section. The 1975 enrollment potential of the two colleges, as shown in Chapter VI of the Master Plan report, assumes a program of policy and action differing materially from the Master Plan since it includes a full development of lower division facilities and a more rapid expansion of upper division and graduate enrollment.

It is assumed that the well-established institutions have developed relatively stable patterns of attraction of new students in terms of first-time freshmen and also of transfer students from other colleges. The rates of entry, as well as the tendency of students to complete academic programs, can be altered materially in the future by the factors listed in this basic assumption.

The major effect of the first factor mentioned — the establishment of new institutions — will be a redistribution of students. The Master Plan suggestion of diversion of potential students in the junior college system means that the six new State colleges and three new University campuses will have minimum lower division enrollments, and to a large degree their upper division enrollments will be comprised of students diverted from the larger State colleges and University campuses to which planning figure limitations are applied in these modifications.

In considering the second factor — implementation of admission and retention proposals — several of the Master Plan recommendations must be examined to determine whether they will have an appreciable effect on college enrollments in the future. Most of these are found in the statements relating to "Admission Policies and Procedures" in the Master Plan report, where it is recommended that:

1. In order to raise materially standards for admission to the lower division, the State colleges select first-time freshmen from the top one-third (33 1/3 per cent) and the University from the top one-eighth (12 1/2 per cent) of all graduates of public high schools in California (as defined by criteria established by each system for itself), with:
    a. Continuation of existing special programs and curricula involving exceptions to this rule subject to approval by the respective Boards, and these to be kept to a minimum, and those that are continued to be reported annually to the coordinating agency. Any new special programs and curricula involving such exceptions to be approved by the coordinating agency.
    b. Graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools held to equivalent levels.
2. Implementation of Recommendation Number 1 be left to the two systems with these provisions:
    a. Each have the new requirements in force for students admitted for Fall, 1962

b. Inasmuch as the Survey Team favors acceptance in both systems of a requirement that all, or almost all, of the recommending units for admission shall be in college preparatory courses, that the application of such a requirement be carefully studied during 1960, and this principle be applied as fully as possible throughout both systems.

3. For both the State colleges and the University, freshmen admissions through special procedures outside the basic requirements of recommending units of high school work and/or aptitude tests (such as specials and exceptions to the rules) be limited to 2 per cent of all freshmen admissions in each system for a given year. Furthermore, that all "limited" students be required to meet regular admission standards. (The State colleges are now in the process of changing rules to require this.)

4. Junior college functions now carried by State colleges and non-degree lower division programs at any State college or University campus (other than extension) be subject to the following rule:

    The equivalent of junior college out-of-district tuition be charged beginning in Fall, 1960, against the counties of residence of all lower division students who are ineligible to admission by regular standards, and the funds collected paid to the General Fund of the State.

    Furthermore, that such junior college functions now carried by State colleges at State expense be terminated not later than July 1, 1964, all admittees thereafter being required to meet standard entrance requirements.

5. The State colleges and the University require a minimum of at least 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit before considering the admission of applicants ineligible to admission as freshmen because of inadequate grades in high school, except for curricula that require earlier transfer, and except also that each State college and campus of the University, through special procedures developed by each, be permitted to accept for earlier transfer not more than 2 per cent of all students who make application for advanced standing in any year.

6. Undergraduate applicants to the State colleges and the University who are legally resident in other states be required to meet higher entrance requirements than are required of residents of California, such out-of-state applicants to stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible. Furthermore, that there be developed and applied a common definition of legal residence for these public segments. . . [5]

The lack of time between the formulation of these recommendations and the revision of the enrollment projections precluded detailed analysis of the probable impact of these policy changes. It was necsssary to frame rapidly the auxiliary assumptions describing this impact.

---

[5] Master Plan Survey Team, op. cit., pp. 4 and 5.

One of the recommendations often referred to as likely to reduce enrollments is the proposed changing of admission standards so that the State colleges select first-time freshmen from the top one-third of the State's public high school graduates, and the University draws from the top one-eighth. It should be noted that in the fall of 1958 the State colleges attracted about six and one-half per cent of California's public high school graduates and the University just under four and one-half per cent. Lacking information on the proportion of these students who fell below the proposed standards, one cannot estimate the effect of this recommendation on the number of entering students. However, for purposes of this study it is assumed that its affect will be negligible. This assumption is reinforced by the provision that each system shall define what it means by the "top" percentage from which it will accept students, and it is very likely that in this process the numerical measure of qualification will be secondary to the establishment of new admission standards that are academically meaningful and administratively effective. As these are applied, the high schools of the State may be expected to orient their programs and, perhaps, alter their standards of grading so that the percentage of graduates meeting the new requirements for State college and University entrance will vary from year to year.

The elimination of junior college functions at Chico and Humboldt State colleges by 1964 should have no appreciable effect on enrollments, a fact evidenced in statements from the two institutions asserting that very few students are now attending under this program.

Perhaps the greatest impact on enrollments will result from the new requirement that students ineligible to admission as freshmen because of inadequate high school grades must have at least 56 units of acceptable credit before transferring to a State college or University campus. Significant numbers of junior college students now transfer to the lower division of the State colleges and the University, and the effect of this recommendation, combined with the effort to divert more lower division students to the junior college system, is expected to reduce the number of such transfers to approximately one-half those admitted under status quo assumptions.

Only a relatively small number of undergraduate students originate outside of the State, and the raising of admission standards is reflected in a reduction in the proportion of first-time out-of-state freshmen, while the effect on transfer students from other states is incorporated into the adjustment discussed in the previous paragraph.

Although these restrictions will reduce enrollments at the lower division level, it is assumed that these same students will enter the State college and University systems as upper division students to continue their education. The net effect, therefore, is to delay their entry through the diversion procedure.

Reference has already been made to the application of enrollment limitations as playing a part in the modification of the enrollment projections. It is assumed that:

7. The maximum number of full-time students that each institution can accommodate is defined by a planning figure which takes into account limitations imposed by site, physical plant and other factors.

While the Master Plan includes in its discussion of "Institutional capacities and Area Needs" a range of recommended enrollment limits for institutions within each system, the preparation of enrollment projections required a specific planning figure for each facility. To fill this need, the Department of Education and the University of California provided the planning figures in Tables 4 and 5. Enrollment projections have been modified so that these upper limits are operative throughout both systems.

Assumptions Underlying the Redistribution of Lower Division Students

The only Master Plan recommendation designed specifically to alter the distribution of students among the segments of public higher education is the

Table 4. COMPARISON OF 1975 *STATUS QUO* ENROLLMENTS WITH PLANNING FIGURES, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES FULL-TIME STUDENTS ONLY

College	Fall 1958	Fall 1975	Planning figure[a]	Difference[b]
Existing:				
Cal Poly KV	1,101	15,700	20,000	-4,300
Cal Poly SLO	3,796	11,050	12,000	-950
Chico	2,608	5,650	6,000	-350
Fresno	4,358	8,500	10,000	-1,500
Humboldt	1,397	4,300	5,000	-700
Long Beach	4,380	24,850	20,000	4,850
Los Angeles	3,334	28,550	20,000	8,550
Sacramento	2,709	7,250	10,000	-2,750
San Diego	5,573	20,150	15,000	5,150
San Fernando	987	18,100	20,000	-1,900
San Francisco	5,250	8,200	10,000	-1,800
San Jose	9,035	24,900	17,000	7,900
New:				
Alameda	-	8,050	15,000	-6,950
North Bay	-	2,500	6,000	-3,500
Orange	-	9,900	20,000	-10,100
Stanislaus	-	2,350	6,000	-3,650
Total	44,528	200,000	212,000	-12,000

[a] As recommended by the Department of Education, December, 1959.

[b] Positive numbers indicate projected *status quo* enrollment in excess of *planning figure*; negative numbers indicate additional enrollment that could be accommodated without exceeding *planning figure*.

Table 5. COMPARISON OF 1975 *STATUS QUO* ENROLLMENTS WITH PLANNING FIGURES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FULL-TIME STUDENTS ONLY

Campus	Fall 1958	Fall 1975	Planning figure[a]	Difference[b]
Existing:				
General:				
Berkeley	19,198	43,950	27,500	16,450
Davis	2,341	7,750	10,000	-2,250
Los Angeles	15,673	33,300	25,200[c]	8,100
Riverside	991	7,050	10,000	-2,950
Santa Barbara	2,710	9,900	12,500	-2,600
Specialized:				
La Jolla Oceanography	53	100	100[d]	-
L. A. Medical Center	601	2,300	2,300[c]	-
S. F. Medical Center	1,534	2,600	3,500	-900[e]
New:				
La Jolla	-	3,550	9,900[d]	-6,350
South Central Coast	-	8,550	10,000	-1,450
Southeast Los Angeles	-	16,950	10,000	6,950
Total	43,101	136,000	121,000	15,000

[a] As recommended by the University of California, December, 1959. Figures do not include two proposed facilities which are to operate as branches of Berkeley and Los Angeles, but which were not announced until after the completion of the *status quo* projections.

[b] Positive numbers indicate projected *status quo* enrollment in excess of *planning figure*; negative numbers indicate additional enrollment that could be accommodated without exceeding planning figure.

[c] Total *planning figure* for Los Angeles, general and specialized facilities, is 27,500.

[d] Total *planning figure* for La Jolla, general and specialized facilities, is 10,000.

[e] Result of change in planning figure made after completion of the *status quo* projections. It is assumed that enrollments at all specialized facilities will equal the *planning figures* in 1975.

proposal that by 1975 there should be a ten percentage point reduction in the proportion of undergraduate students enrolled in the lower division of the State college and University systems, to be attained through a diversion of enrollees to the public junior college system. As set down in the Master Plan, this recommendation is forthright in purpose and brief in statement, but such brevity is possible only because no reference is made to the all-inclusive and strong system of controls that will have to be imposed if the goal of diversion is to be achieved. It was necessary to develop, therefore, a hypothetical series of administrative policies in order to derive a numerical measure of the impact of the Master Plan on future enrollments.

The first administrative policy to be assumed is that, in diverting lower division students from the State colleges and the University, each system's status quo enrollment of such students will be reduced in the same proportion so that each system's percentage of the two-system total remains unchanged. Under the status quo assumptions, the University is expected to enroll one-third of the lower division total in the two systems in 1975. This policy provides that the University will still have one-third of the lower division students remaining in the two systems after the diversion of approximately 50,000 students to the junior colleges of the State.

Second, it is assumed that each system will set up broad classifications of institutions in terms of the controls placed on lower division enrollments. In reducing the number of freshman and sophomore students to approximately forty per cent of the undergraduate totals by 1975, it is assumed that the greatest restrictions will be placed on new facilities, less stringent measures will be applied to those institutions reaching their planning figure limits in the interval, and relatively minor controls will be imposed on the remainder.

The application of major limitations on lower division enrollments at newly established and approved new institutions derives from the fact that the admission of lower division students at these facilities will require increased diversion at other institutions if the basic goal is to be reached. It is assumed that a minimum of thirty per cent lower division enrollment is needed at the new schools to provide a balanced undergraduate program.

Control of enrollment at those large institutions where planning figure limits will apply involves the assumption that 1975 lower division students will comprise thirty-five per cent of all undergraduates at four State colleges (Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Jose) and forty per cent of the undergraduate enrollments at two University campuses (Berkeley and Los Angeles). These ratios suggest that the major emphasis at the larger institutions will be on the instruction of upper division and graduate students. At the same time, there will be a minimum disturbance of present enrollment patterns, since these percentage distributions can be achieved without reducing present freshman enrollments except at the Berkeley campus of the University.

For established facilities which are not constrained by planning figure limitations, it is assumed that there will be no change in the numbers of first-time freshmen admitted from those estimated in the status quo projections. This assumption implies the application of administrative controls, for it means that students diverted from the new space-limited State colleges and University campuses will not be admitted even though space could be provided for them. To admit them would invalidate the basic goal of diversion to the junior college system.

A third assumption is that the status quo public junior college projections will be increased only by the number of students diverted from the other two publicly controlled systems. This means that no allowance has been made for the possible additional enrollment generated by the establishment of new facilities. The complex problems involved in making these adjustment were such that it was felt preferable to limit the analysis to the minimum effect of the diversion process.

The fourth, and perhaps most crucial, assumption is that the lower division students diverted from each system will complete their upper division studies by returning to the original institution of their choice. That is, the *status quo* projection for the upper division enrollment at each school remains essentially unchanged except where planning figure limitations require diversion of upper division students also. Whether students will make a different selection of a four-year institution when the final decision is delayed for two or more years is, of course, unknown at this time. There remains also the question of what efforts will be made to acquaint junior college students with the academic advantages of attending the various upper division institutions that may be available to them. When the growth of undergraduate enrollments within each system is made dependent upon the ability to attract larger numbers of transfer upper division students, policies and procedures may be brought into play that could alter the balance between systems and within each system. Viewed in this light, the arbitrary assumption that the *status quo* pattern will hold for upper division enrollments is open to serious question, but no reasonable alternative has yet been found.

In summary, this section has dealt with the effect of the Master Plan and its major recommendations upon enrollment projections, leading to the formulation of certain enrollment projections. It is believed that the administrative controls assumed herein are reasonable and acceptable in that they imply a minimum framework for achieving the Master Plan objective of redistributing enrollments.

Section IV

THE MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF ENROLLMENT

The figures presented in this section show the modification and redistribution of the numbers of students which would result from the implementation of the Master Plan. In over-all terms, the new projection of 659,550 full-time graded students in 1975 represents an increase of 6,000 over the comparable status quo projection of 654,550 students.[1] This gain results primarily from establishing new institutions and campuses between 1958 and 1975 which may be expected to generate additional enrollment within their immediate areas of location.

Modified enrollments for each State college and University campus in 1975 are compared with the status quo projections and the planning figures in Table 6. From this table it is possible to show in a single figure the expected effect on each institution of the many assumptions and administrative policies that will be needed to realize the Master Plan recommendations.

Because of the major importance of the proposals relating to the diversion of lower division students to the junior college system, Tables 7 and 8 are reproduced here in the same form that they appear in Chapter IV of the Master Plan report. Table 7 indicates that the junior college system will grow by 224 per cent from 1958 to 1975 under the modified assumptions, compared with a 176 per cent gain in the status quo projections. The diversion process at the same time will materially reduce the lower division growth rates of the State college and University systems as approximately 43,000 students are shifted to junior colleges.

---

[1] See Table 2, page 11, which summarizes the status quo full-time graded enrollments by system and level. For purposes of comparability, all enrollment projections used in this section exclude special and other non-graded students.

Table 6. STATUS QUO AND MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT, STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FALL, 1975

Facility	Fall, 1975 enrollment	
	Status quo	Modified
State colleges:		
Existing:		
Cal Poly KV	15,700	14,750
Cal Poly SLO	11,050	11,050
Chico	5,650	5,600
Fresno	8,500	8,300
Humboldt	4,300	4,250
Long Beach	24,850	19,800
Los Angeles	28,550	19,700
Sacramento	7,250	7,050
San Diego	20,150	14,750
San Fernando	18,100	17,600
San Francisco	8,200	8,050
San Jose	24,900	17,000
New:		
Alameda	8,050	5,800
North Bay	2,500	2,400
Orange	9,900	8,900
San Bernardino	-	5,200
Southwest Los Angeles	-	8,300
Stanislaus	2,350	2,150
Total	200,000	180,650
University of California:		
Existing:		
General:		
Berkeley	43,950	30,000
Davis	7,750	9,950
Los Angeles	33,300	27,700
Riverside	7,050	9,100
Santa Barbara	9,900	12,000
Specialized:		
La Jolla Oceanography	100	100
L. A. Medical Center	2,300	2,300
S. F. Medical Center	2,600	3,500
New:		
La Jolla	3,550	5,650
South Central Coast	8,550	8,450
Southeast Los Angeles	16,950	10,000
Total	136,000	118,750

Source: Tables 4, 5, M3 and M4.

Table 7. RATE OF GROWTH IN FULL-TIME LOWER DIVISION ENROLLMENT BY SEGMENT
STATUS QUO AND MODIFIED PROJECTIONS, 1958 TO 1975

Segment	1958 Reported Enrollment	1975 Status Quo Projections		1975 Modified Projections	
		Number	Per cent of Growth	Number	Per cent of Growth
Junior Colleges	89,206	246,350	176	288,950[a]	224[b]
State Colleges	20,052	91,750	358	67,400	236
Univ. of California	14,030	45,900	227	28,800	105
Indep. Colleges	20,792	34,250	65	34,250	65
Total	144,080	418,250	190	419,400	191

[a] The difference of 42,600 junior college enrollees shown here between status quo and modified projections is less than the 50,000 the Team believes should have been diverted by 1975.

[b] The modified projections do not fully conform to the Team's recommendation that fastest rate of lower division growth should be in junior colleges.

Table 8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY LEVEL, STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA - 1975
MODIFIED PROJECTIONS

Level	State Colleges		University of California	
	Number of Students	Per cent of Undergraduates	Number of Students	Per cent of Undergraduates
Lower Division[a]	67,400	40.0	28,800	36.9
Upper Division	100,600	60.0	49,350	63.1
Undergraduate Total	168,000	100.0	78,150	100.0

[a] The modified projections reduce the lower division proportion of all undergraduate enrollment for both segments somewhat below the Team's recommendation as quoted above.

Source: Master Plan Survey Team, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975, Chapter IV, Tables 7 and 8, p. 62.

Table 8 demonstrates the degree to which the application of a specific set of administrative assumptions results in lower-upper division ratios that approximate those recommended in the Master Plan. Whether actual enrollments fifteen years hence approach the distribution shown here depends in part upon the future reconciliation of detailed policies that enter into their derivation.

The need for such reconciliation is suggested by the footnotes in the two tables. The footnote in Table 8 states that the lower division enrollment was reduced somewhat below the forty-one per cent proportion recommended in the Master Plan. At the same time, the first footnote in Table 7 points out that fewer lower division students were diverted to the junior college system than was proposed. To have achieved this, and also the goal mentioned in the second footnote, would have reduced still further the percentage of students enrolled in the lower division of the State colleges and the University.

Similarly, the University's proportion of lower division students could be raised from the 36.9 per cent shown for 1975 in Table 9 by diverting fewer students to the junior colleges, but if this were done at the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses where most of the diversion is required, it would necessitate the transfer of upper division and graduate students to other campuses in order to meet the planning figure limitations. It may be inferred from these and other technical considerations that in their final form the recommendations of the Master Plan relating to enrollment control will have to be framed in terms of individual colleges and campuses, with system-wide totals given secondary place. At the same time, the need for a coordinated set of objectives should lead to the interpretation of the present recommendations in very broad and general terms.

For purposes of more detailed analysis there follow four tables setting down the modified full-time enrollment projections by system, institution and division level, as well as by geographic area. Tables M1 through M4 correspond in format and arrangement to the status quo tables included in Appendix B.

By comparing institutions as well as systems, and by comparing levels within institutions, one can realize more fully the impact of the Master Plan on enrollment projections. Through such a procedure the feasibility and acceptability of administrative policies can be adequately explored.

Table M1. SUMMARY OF MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT OF CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN SURVEY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, TO 1975

Type of Institution and class level	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL INSTITUTIONS					
All levels	225,615	276,600	398,650	532,750	667,350
Lower division	144,080	183,100	263,450	342,900	419,400
Upper division	55,024	63,250	92,200	131,450	175,500
Graduate	22,246	25,700	37,250	51,700	64,650
Special	4,265	4,550	5,750	6,700	7,800
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES					
All levels	91,162	115,750	172,900	230,000	294,000
Lower division	89,206	113,450	169,650	225,900	288,950
Special	1,956	2,300	3,250	4,100	5,050
STATE COLLEGES					
All levels	44,528	58,600	98,950	145,200	180,650
Lower division	20,052	28,000	45,850	59,700	67,400
Upper division	21,701	27,200	46,800	75,650	100,600
Graduate	2,681	3,400	6,300	9,850	12,650
Special	94	-	-	-	-
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA					
All levels	43,101	50,400	66,250	89,150	118,750
Lower division	14,030	18,350	20,350	25,700	28,800
Upper division	16,149	17,350	23,900	31,900	49,350
Graduate	12,922	14,700	22,000	31,550	40,600
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES					
All levels	26,801	30,950	38,550	45,400	49,900
Lower division	14,766	17,100	21,250	25,050	27,500
Upper division	9,520	10,850	13,400	15,650	17,100
Graduate	1,851	2,300	3,050	3,800	4,300
Special	664	700	850	900	1,000
INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES					
All levels	20,023	20,900	22,000	23,000	24,050
Lower division	6,026	6,200	6,350	6,550	6,750
Upper division	7,654	7,850	8,100	8,250	8,450
Graduate	4,792	5,300	5,900	6,500	7,100
Special	1,551	1,550	1,650	1,700	1,750

Table M2. MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location and category[a]	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL JUNIOR COLLEGES					
Total	89,206	113,450	169,650	225,900	288,950
Status-quo	89,206	113,450	159,350	201,100	246,350
Diverted	-	-	10,300	24,800	42,600
SEA 1, NORTH COASTAL AREA					
Total	-	-	50	100	150
Status-quo	-	-	-	-	-
Diverted	-	-	50	100	150
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA					
Total	1,749	2,200	3,400	4,150	5,000
Status-quo	1,749	2,200	3,200	3,750	4,400
Diverted	-	-	200	400	600
SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA					
Total	2,101	2,650	3,850	4,650	5,700
Status-quo	2,101	2,650	3,600	4,250	5,150
Diverted	-	-	250	400	550
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA					
Total	801	1,000	1,400	1,600	1,700
Status-quo	801	1,000	1,250	1,400	1,400
Diverted	-	-	150	200	300
SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA					
Total	1,688	1,950	2,400	2,300	2,400
Status-quo	1,688	1,950	2,200	1,800	1,750
Diverted	-	-	200	500	650
SEA 6, SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA					
Total	1,596	1,650	1,850	1,900	1,750
Status-quo	1,596	1,650	1,700	1,650	1,450
Diverted	-	-	150	250	300
SEA 7, SOUTH COASTAL AREA					
Total	1,199	1,500	2,150	2,650	2,750
Status-quo	1,199	1,500	2,050	2,500	2,550
Diverted	-	-	100	150	200
SEA 8, IMPERIAL VALLEY AREA					
Total	240	250	350	350	400
Status-quo	240	250	300	300	300
Diverted	-	-	50	50	100

[a] "Status quo": enrollment under *status quo* assumptions, excluding special students (see Table JC2, Appendix B). "Diverted": projected enrollment resulting from diversion to junior colleges through limiting lower division in State college and University systems.

Table M2. (cont.)

SEA of location and category	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA 9, SIERRA AREA					
Total	1,563	2,300	3,100	3,450	3,700
Status-quo	1,563	2,300	2,900	3,150	3,300
Diverted	-	-	200	300	400
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	13,250	16,550	25,600	32,150	36,500
Status-quo	13,250	16,550	22,950	25,950	27,250
Diverted	-	-	2,650	6,200	9,250
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	2,173	3,550	6,550	10,600	15,750
Status-quo	2,173	3,550	5,550	8,500	11,750
Diverted	-	-	1,000	2,100	4,000
SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	3,142	3,400	5,950	7,850	9,500
Status-quo	3,142	3,400	5,650	7,450	9,000
Diverted	-	-	300	400	500
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	1,722	1,650	2,300	2,550	2,450
Status-quo	1,722	1,650	2,150	2,300	2,150
Diverted	-	-	150	250	300
SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	2,881	3,700	4,650	5,550	5,650
Status-quo	2,881	3,700	4,500	5,300	5,350
Diverted	-	-	150	250	300
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	43,935	57,000	83,900	114,500	154,600
Status-quo	43,935	57,000	80,400	104,900	135,100
Diverted	-	-	3,500	9,600	19,500
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	3,189	4,050	7,600	11,900	15,300
Status-quo	3,189	4,050	6,850	9,100	11,100
Diverted	-	-	750	2,800	4,200
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	5,051	6,550	9,950	14,250	20,150
Status-quo	5,051	6,550	9,700	13,750	19,300
Diverted	-	-	250	500	850
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	715	850	1,200	1,550	1,600
Status-quo	715	850	1,150	1,450	1,450
Diverted	-	-	50	100	150
SEA K, BAKERSFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total	2,211	2,650	3,400	3,850	3,900
Status-quo	2,211	2,650	3,250	3,600	3,600
Diverted	-	-	150	250	300

Note: Figures do not include full-time special students. It is assumed that the number of special students shown in Work Table JC2 (page 58) will remain unchanged under modified projection assumptions. (see Table M1)

Table M3. MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL STATE COLLEGES					
All levels	44,528	58,600	98,950	145,200	180,650
Lower division	20,052	28,000	45,850	59,700	67,400
Upper division	21,701	27,200	46,800	75,650	100,600
Graduate	2,681	3,400	6,300	9,850	12,650
Special[a]	94	-	-	-	-
SEA 1, NORTH COASTAL AREA					
Humboldt					
All levels	1,397	1,750	2,350	3,300	4,250
Lower division	892	1,050	1,300	1,750	2,200
Upper division	471	650	900	1,350	1,800
Graduate	33	50	150	200	250
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA					
North Bay					
All levels	-	-	450	1,650	2,400
Lower division	-	-	100	800	750
Upper division	-	-	300	800	1,550
Graduate	-	-	50	50	100
SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA					
Cal Poly-SLO					
All levels	3,796	4,600	6,950	9,550	11,050
Lower division	2,544	2,550	3,900	5,100	5,700
Upper division	1,195	1,950	2,950	4,300	5,150
Graduate	46	100	100	150	200
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA					
Chico					
All levels	2,608	2,950	3,950	5,200	5,600
Lower division	1,436	1,700	2,150	2,550	2,750
Upper division	1,071	1,150	1,600	2,300	2,450
Graduate	101	100	200	350	400
SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA					
Stanislaus County					
All levels	-	-	550	1,600	2,150
Lower division	-	-	200	650	700
Upper division	-	-	300	900	1,300
Graduate	-	-	50	50	150
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total					
All levels	5,250	5,900	7,900	11,100	13,850
Lower division	2,172	2,450	3,400	4,650	5,050
Upper division	2,376	2,650	3,450	5,250	7,300
Graduate	700	800	1,050	1,200	1,500

Table M3. (cont.)

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
Alameda County					
All levels	-	100	1,500	3,550	5,800
Lower division	-	-	700	1,500	1,700
Upper division	-	100	650	1,800	3,650
Graduate	-	-	150	250	450
San Francisco					
All levels	5,250	5,800	6,400	7,550	8,050
Lower division	2,172	2,450	2,700	3,150	3,350
Upper division	2,376	2,550	2,800	3,450	3,650
Graduate	700	800	900	950	1,050
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA					
San Jose					
All levels	9,035	10,750	12,300	14,700	17,000
Lower division	4,274	5,400	5,200	5,200	5,200
Upper division	4,287	4,800	6,200	8,000	9,700
Graduate	474	550	900	1,500	2,100
SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Sacramento					
All levels	2,709	3,150	4,400	5,950	7,050
Lower division	1,117	1,250	1,750	2,200	2,550
Upper division	1,452	1,750	2,400	3,350	4,000
Graduate	131	150	250	400	500
SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Fresno					
All levels	4,358	4,900	6,200	7,950	8,300
Lower division	1,877	2,450	2,750	3,400	3,350
Upper division	2,292	2,250	3,150	4,100	4,400
Graduate	179	200	300	450	550
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total					
All levels	9,802	17,950	43,300	68,950	89,050
Lower division	3,146	7,500	20,250	27,850	32,850
Upper division	5,821	9,250	20,350	36,500	50,550
Graduate	778	1,200	2,700	4,600	5,650
Cal Poly-KV					
All levels	1,101	2,150	5,450	10,500	14,750
Lower division	887	1,200	2,750	4,650	6,700
Upper division	210	950	2,450	5,400	7,400
Graduate	-	-	250	450	650
Long Beach					
All levels	4,380	6,800	12,900	17,500	19,800
Lower division	1,912	3,100	5,500	6,550	6,550
Upper division	2,158	3,350	6,450	9,850	12,100
Graduate	264	350	950	1,100	1,150

Table M3. (cont.)

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
Los Angeles					
All levels	3,334	5,950	13,150	16,650	19,700
Lower division	65	1,650	6,150	6,250	6,250
Upper division	2,818	3,700	6,100	8,700	11,650
Graduate	451	600	900	1,700	1,800
Orange County					
All levels	-	600	2,800	6,100	8,900
Lower division	-	-	1,300	2,500	2,800
Upper division	-	500	1,400	3,300	5,600
Graduate	-	100	100	300	500
San Fernando					
All levels	987	2,450	9,000	14,050	17,600
Lower division	282	1,550	4,550	6,750	8,250
Upper division	635	750	3,950	6,550	8,400
Graduate	63	150	500	750	950
Southwest Los Angeles					
All levels	-	-	-	4,150	8,300
Lower division	-	-	-	1,150	2,300
Upper division	-	-	-	2,700	5,400
Graduate	-	-	-	300	600
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA					
San Diego					
All levels	5,573	6,650	10,600	12,650	14,750
Lower division	2,594	3,650	4,850	4,850	4,850
Upper division	2,736	2,750	5,200	7,100	9,050
Graduate	239	250	550	700	850
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA					
San Bernardino					
All levels	-	-	-	2,600	5,200
Lower division	-	-	-	700	1,450
Upper division	-	-	-	1,700	3,350
Graduate	-	-	-	200	400

---

[a] It is assumed, as in the status quo projections, that Special will be eliminated as a separate classification.

Table M4. MODIFIED PROJECTIONS OF FALL GRADED ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF CAMPUS LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
THE STATE					
All Campuses					
All levels	43,101	50,400	66,250	89,150	118,750
Lower division	14,030	18,350	20,350	25,700	28,800
Upper division	16,149	17,350	23,900	31,900	49,350
Graduate	12,922	14,700	22,000	31,550	40,600
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA					
Davis					
All levels	2,341	2,900	4,700	6,350	9,950
Lower division	1,039	1,300	2,000	2,400	2,800
Upper division	756	950	1,700	2,400	2,750
Graduate	546	650	1,000	1,550	4,400
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total					
All levels	20,732	23,500	26,500	30,300	33,500
Lower division	6,551	8,200	6,950	6,450	6,250
Upper division	6,937	7,150	8,500	8,750	11,250
Graduate	7,244	8,150	11,050	15,100	16,000
Berkeley					
All levels	19,198	21,900	24,500	27,550	30,000[a]
Lower division	6,551	8,200	6,950	6,450	6,250
Upper division	6,937	7,150	8,500	8,750	11,250
Graduate	5,710	6,550	9,050	12,350	12,500
San Francisco					
All levels	1,534	1,600	2,000	2,750	3,500
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	1,534	1,600	2,000	2,750	3,500
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA					
South Central Coast					
All levels	-	-	950	4,000	8,450
Lower division	-	-	500	1,950	2,000
Upper division	-	-	350	1,550	4,450
Graduate	-	-	100	500	2,000
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total					
All levels	16,274	18,150	24,350	33,850	40,000
Lower division	4,354	5,550	6,150	8,050	8,300
Upper division	6,924	6,850	9,050	13,000	17,200
Graduate	4,996	5,750	9,150	12,800	14,500

Table M4. (cont.)

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)	Projected (fall)			
	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
Los Angeles					
All levels	15,673	17,550	20,850	24,300	27,700[a]
Lower division	4,354	5,550	5,250	5,250	5,500
Upper division	6,924	6,850	8,150	8,950	12,000
Graduate	4,395	5,150	7,450	10,100	10,200
Los Angeles Medical Center					
All levels	601	600	1,600	1,900	2,300
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	601	600	1,600	1,900	2,300
Southeast Los Angeles					
All levels	-	-	1,900	7,650	10,000
Lower division	-	-	900	2,800	2,800
Upper division	-	-	900	4,050	5,200
Graduate	-	-	100	800	2,000
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Total					
All levels	53	50	750	1,600	5,750
Lower division	-	-	100	650	1,550
Upper division	-	-	350	550	3,200
Graduate	53	50	300	400	1,000
La Jolla					
All levels	-	-	650	1,500	5,650
Lower division	-	-	100	650	1,550
Upper division	-	-	350	550	3,200
Graduate	-	-	200	300	900
La Jolla (Oceanography)					
All levels	53	50	100	100	100
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	53	50	100	100	100
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA					
Riverside					
All levels	991	2,000	3,200	5,000	9,100
Lower division	536	1,100	1,500	2,150	2,950
Upper division	452	900	1,600	2,350	4,950
Graduate	3	-	100	500	1,200
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA					
Santa Barbara					
All levels	2,710	3,800	5,800	8,050	12,000
Lower division	1,550	2,200	3,150	4,050	4,950
Upper division	1,080	1,500	2,350	3,300	5,550
Graduate	80	100	300	700	1,500

[a] Includes 250 lower division and 2,250 upper division students at proposed branch facility.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Appendix A

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

This is a list of the "institutions of higher education in California included in the Master Plan Survey enrollment projections, by State economic area of location and type of institution."

Following the list is a brief summary of the criteria involved in selecting institutions for inclusion in the survey and a year by year tabulation of changes in the number and category of institutions of higher education.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN SURVEY ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS, BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION

SEA 1, NORTH COASTAL AREA
- State Colleges:
  - Humboldt State College, Arcata, Humboldt.

SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA
- State Colleges:
  - North Bay State College
- Public Junior Colleges:
  - Napa College, Napa, Napa.
  - Santa Rosa Junior College, Santa Rosa, Sonoma.
- Independent Colleges:
  - Pacific Union College, Angwin, Napa.

SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA
- State Colleges:
  - California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo.
- Public Junior Colleges:
  - Cabrillo College, Watsonville, Santa Cruz.
  - Hartnell College, Salinas, Monterey.
  - Monterey Peninsula College, Monterey, Monterey.
  - San Benito College, Hollister, San Benito.
  - San Luis Obispo Junior College, San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo.

SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA
- State University:
  - University of California, Davis, Yolo.
- State Colleges:
  - Chico State College, Chico, Butte.
- Public Junior Colleges:
  - Yuba College, Marysville, Yuba.

SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA
- State Colleges:
  - Stanislaus State College, Modesto, Stanislaus.
- Public Junior Colleges:
  - Modesto Junior College, Modesto, Stanislaus.

SEA 6, SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA
- Public Junior Colleges:
  - College of the Sequoias, Visalia, Tulare.
  - Porterville College, Porterville, Tulare.

SEA 7, SOUTH COASTAL AREA
- Public Junior Colleges:
  - Ventura College, Ventura, Ventura.
- Independent Colleges:
  - St. John's College, Camarillo, Ventura.

SEA 8, IMPERIAL VALLEY AREA

Public Junior Colleges:

Imperial Valley College, El Centro, Imperial.

SEA 9, SIERRA AREA

Subarea 9a

Public Junior Colleges:

College of the Siskiyous, Weed, Siskiyou.
Lassen Junior College, Susanville, Lassen.
Shasta College, Redding, Shasta.

Subarea 9b

Public Junior Colleges:

Sierra College, Auburn, Placer.

Independent Colleges:

Deep Springs College, Deep Springs, Inyo.

SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA

State University:

University of California, Berkeley, Alameda.

State Colleges:

Alameda County State College, Hayward, Alameda.
San Francisco State College, San Francisco, San Francisco.

Public Junior Colleges:

City College of San Francisco, San Francisco, San Francisco.
College of Marin, Kentfield, Marin.
College of San Mateo, San Mateo, San Mateo.
Contra Costa College, San Pablo, Contra Costa.
Diablo Valley College, Concord, Contra Costa.
Oakland City College, Oakland, Alameda.
Vallejo Junior College, Vallejo, Solano.

Independent Universities and Professional Schools:

Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, Alameda.
Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Alameda.
San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Marin.

Independent Colleges:

Armstrong College, Berkeley, Alameda.
California College of Arts & Crafts, Oakland, Alameda.
California College of Chiropody, San Francisco, San Francisco.
California Concordia College, Oakland, Alameda.
California School of Fine Arts, San Francisco, San Francisco.
Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, Alameda.
Cogswell Polytechnical College, San Francisco, San Francisco.
College of Notre Dame, Belmont, San Mateo.
College of Physicians & Surgeons, San Francisco, San Francisco.
College of the Holy Names, Oakland, Alameda.
Dominican College of San Rafael, San Rafael, Marin.
Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Alameda.
Golden Gate College, San Francisco, San Francisco.
Menlo College, Menlo Park, San Mateo.
Mills College, Oakland, Alameda.
Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Alameda.
St. Mary's College of California, St. Mary's College, Contra Costa.

St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, San Mateo.
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco, San Francisco.
Simpson Bible College, San Francisco, San Francisco.
University of San Francisco, San Francisco, San Francisco.

SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA

State University:
University of California, South Central Coast.

State Colleges:
San Jose State College, San Jose, Santa Clara.

Public Junior Colleges:
Foothill College, Mountain View, Santa Clara.
San Jose City College, San Jose, Santa Clara.

Independent Universities and Professional Schools:
Stanford University, Palo Alto, Santa Clara.

Independent Colleges:
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Santa Clara.

SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA

State Colleges:
Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Sacramento.

Public Junior Colleges:
American River Junior College, Sacramento, Sacramento.
Sacramento City College, Sacramento, Sacramento.

SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Public Junior Colleges:
Stockton College, Stockton, San Joaquin.

Independent Universities and Professional Schools:
College of the Pacific, Stockton, San Joaquin.

Independent Colleges:
Humphreys College, Stockton, San Joaquin.

SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA

State Colleges:
Fresno State College, Fresno, Fresno.

Public Junior Colleges:
Coalinga College, Coalinga, Fresno.
Fresno City College, Fresno, Fresno.
Reedley College, Reedley, Fresno.

SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA

State University:
University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
University of California, Southeast Los Angeles.

State Colleges:
California State Polytechnic College (Kellogg-Voorhis Campus), Pomona, Los Angeles.
Long Beach State College, Long Beach, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts & Sciences, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Orange County State College, Fullerton, Orange.
San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, Los Angeles.

Public Junior Colleges:

Antelope Valley Junior College, Lancaster, Los Angeles.
Cerritos College, Norwalk, Los Angeles.
Citrus Junior College, Azusa, Los Angeles.
Compton College, Compton, Los Angeles.
East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
El Camino College, El Camino, Los Angeles.
Fullerton Junior College, Fullerton, Orange.
Glendale College, Glendale, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Metropolitan College of Business, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Pierce College, Woodland Hills, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, Los Angeles.
Long Beach City College, Long Beach, Los Angeles.
Mt. San Antonio College, Walnut, Los Angeles.
Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa, Orange.
Pasadena City College, Pasadena, Los Angeles.
Santa Ana College, Santa Ana, Orange.
Santa Monica City College, Santa Monica, Los Angeles.

Independent Universities and Professional Schools:

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Los Angeles.
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Los Angeles.
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.

Independent Colleges:

Art Center School, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Azusa College, Azusa, Los Angeles.
Biola College, La Mirada, Los Angeles.
California Baptist Theological Seminary, Covina, Los Angeles.
Chapman College, Orange, Orange.
Chouinard Art Institute, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Los Angeles.
College of Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Electronic Technical Institute, Inglewood, Los Angeles.
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Los Angeles.
George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, Los Angeles.
Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
La Verne College, La Verne, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles College of Optometry, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Conservatory of Music & Arts, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles Pacific College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Loyola University of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Marymount College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Northrop Aeronautical Institute, Inglewood, Los Angeles.
Occidental College, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Pasadena College, Pasadena, Los Angeles.
Pomona College, Claremont, Los Angeles.
Sawyer School of Business, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Scripps College, Claremont, Los Angeles.
Southern California College, Costa Mesa, Orange.
University of Judaism, Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Whittier College, Whittier, Los Angeles.

SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA

State University:

- University of California, La Jolla, San Diego.

State Colleges:

- San Diego State College, San Diego, San Diego.

Public Junior Colleges:

- Oceanside-Carlsbad College, Oceanside, San Diego.
- Palomar College, San Marcos, San Diego.
- San Diego Junior College, San Diego, San Diego.

Independent Colleges:

- California Western University, San Diego, San Diego.
- San Diego College for Women, San Diego, San Diego.
- San Luis Rey College, San Luis Rey, San Diego.
- University of San Diego, San Diego, San Diego.

SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA

State University:

- University of California, Riverside, Riverside.

Public Junior Colleges:

- Chaffey College, Ontario, San Bernardino.
- College of the Desert, Palm Desert, Riverside.
- Palo Verde College, Blythe, Riverside.
- Riverside City College, Riverside, Riverside.
- San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino, San Bernardino.

Independent Universities and Professional Schools:

- College of Medical Evangelists, Loma Linda, San Bernardino.

Independent Colleges:

- La Sierra College, Arlington, Riverside.
- University of Redlands, Redlands, San Bernardino.
- Upland College, Upland, San Bernardino.

SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA

State University:

- University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara.

Public Junior Colleges:

- Allan Hancock College, Santa Maria, Santa Barbara.
- Santa Barbara Junior College, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara.

Independent Colleges:

- Westmont College, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara.

SEA K, BAKERSFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA

Public Junior Colleges:

- Bakersfield College, Bakersfield, Kern.
- Taft College, Taft, Kern.

Basis for Inclusion in the List of Institutions of Higher Education

The basic source of institutions included in the Master Plan Survey is the Education Directory, 1958-59, Part 3, "Higher Education," published by the United States Office of Education. All California institutions included in this edition of the Directory are found in the preceding list, with the following exceptions:

University of California

Three campuses, La Jolla, Southeast Los Angeles, and South Central Coast, approved for future consideration were added.

State Colleges

Four approved new colleges, designated the Alameda County State College, North Bay State College, Orange County State College and Stanislaus County State College were added.

Junior Colleges

Two new junior colleges are included: Cabrillo College, which opened in the fall of 1959, and College of the Desert, tentatively scheduled to open in the fall of 1961.

Independent Colleges

The University of San Diego has been added to the list on the basis that it was accredited in February, 1959, following the publication of the Directory.

Hebrew Union College was omitted because no data on its current enrollment are available in the reports prepared by the Department of Education, Bureau of Education Research, and no reply has been received to the questionnaire submitted by the Department of Finance.

The Pacific Bible Seminary, Long Beach, which first appeared in the 1957-58 Directory, was omitted from the initial list through oversight.

Basis for Differentiating between Independent Colleges and Independent Universities

In preparing a dual classification for independent institutions, the category "independent universities and professional schools" has been defined as including those institutions listed in the Education Directory, 1958-59, which grant Doctor of Philosophy and equivalent degrees. All other institutions have been designated "independent colleges."

Annual Changes in the Number of Institutions of Higher Education in California as Reported by the Education Directory, Part 3, and as Approved by Appropriate Governing Bodies

Changes in publicly controlled institutions:

Fall

1955 Public Junior Colleges

American River Junior College opened, succeeding
Grant Technical College, (SEA C)

1956 (No change)

1957 State Colleges

San Fernando Valley State College opened, (SEA F)

Public Junior Colleges

Cerritos College opened for late afternoon and evening classes and moved to new campus in September, 1959, (SEA F)
College of the Siskiyous opened for adult classes and moved to new campus in September, 1959, (SEA 9)

1958 Public Junior Colleges

Foothill College opened in temporary facilities, (SEA A)

1959 and beyond University of California

Assumed fall opening dates:

La Jolla campus, 1961, (SEA G)
Southeast Los Angeles campus, 1962, (SEA F)
South Central Coast campus, 1963, (SEA B)

State Colleges

Assumed fall opening dates:

Alameda County State College, 1959, (SEA A)

Orange County State College, 1959, (SEA F)
North Bay State College, 1961, (SEA 2)
Stanislaus County State College, 1961, (SEA 5)

Public Junior Colleges

Assumed fall opening dates:

Cabrillo College, 1959, (SEA 3)
College of the Desert, 1960 (SEA H)
Barstow Junior College, in process, (SEA H)
Victor Valley Junior College, in process, (SEA H)

Discontinued:

San Luis Obispo Junior College as of July 1, 1959, (SEA 3)

Changes in independent institutions:

Fall	
1955	Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, added, (SEA A) Simpson Bible College, moved from Seattle, Washington, to San Francisco, (SEA A)
1956	California Western University, added, (SEA G) Chouinard Art Institute, added, (SEA F) College of the Pacific, reclassified from independent college to independent university, (SEA D) Marymount College, added, (SEA F)
1957	College of Medical Evangelists, reclassified from independent college to independent university, (SEA H) Electronic Technical Institute, added, (SEA F) Humphreys College, added, (SEA D) Pacific Bible Seminary, added, (SEA F) San Luis Rey College, added, (SEA G) Sawyer School of Business, Los Angeles, added, (SEA F)
1958	Harvey Mudd College, added, (SEA F)
1959	Healds Engineering College, San Francisco, added, (SEA A) Pacific Oaks Friends School, added, (SEA F) Saint Margaret's House, added, (SEA A) Sawyer School of Business, Los Angeles, dropped, (SEA F) Southern California School of Theology, added, (SEA F) University of San Diego, College for Men, added, (SEA G)*

* Included in status quo projections.

Appendix B

THE STATUS QUO ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

Enrollment data are shown for each system with the following coding of tables:

High school graduates	HS
Total college students	TC
Junior college students	JC
State college students	SC
University of California students	UC
Independent college students	IC
Independent university students	IU

Numbers following this coding in each table represent:

Total enrollment	1
Full-time enrollment	2
Part-time enrollment	3

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK– NOT FILMED

Table HS1. REPORTED AND PROJECTED PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA

SEA	Reported (June)			Projected (June)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
1	1,381	1,538	1,694	2,100	2,650	3,300	3,500
2	1,291	1,607	1,603	2,200	3,050	3,700	4,250
3	2,037	2,368	2,429	3,000	4,050	4,800	5,300
4	2,095	2,417	2,484	3,150	3,700	4,000	4,200
5	1,970	2,392	2,414	2,800	3,300	3,500	3,450
6	2,162	2,430	2,502	2,750	2,750	2,700	2,300
7	999	1,222	1,386	1,700	2,300	2,850	3,150
8	528	566	615	650	700	750	750
9	2,486	2,827	2,959	3,600	4,000	4,050	4,000
A	16,257	17,865	19,174	24,050	32,200	37,950	39,450
B	2,751	3,600	3,959	5,550	9,750	14,650	21,200
C	2,516	3,427	3,902	4,450	7,400	9,900	11,600
D	1,762	2,025	1,964	2,400	2,900	3,100	2,850
E	2,821	3,191	3,338	4,050	4,750	5,600	5,550
F	36,720	43,412	47,445	63,100	89,800	120,000	153,900
G	5,273	5,484	6,622	8,500	13,800	18,900	22,200
H	4,576	5,198	5,887	7,800	11,250	15,950	22,250
J	843	879	987	1,300	1,550	2,100	1,850
K	2,292	2,490	2,743	3,250	3,850	4,300	4,300
The State	90,760	104,938	114,107	146,400	203,750	262,100	316,050

Work Table TC1. SUMMARY OF FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT OF CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN SURVEY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, TO 1975

State economic area and category	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL INSTITUTIONS							
All levels	244,021	305,725	336,186	419,650	628,900	839,800	1,036,050
Lower division	141,332	175,655	197,274	251,600	362,600	469,050	578,600
Upper division	48,757	59,271	61,378	71,200	111,750	158,550	199,150
Graduate	25,871	29,986	31,011	35,600	50,150	66,500	81,450
Special	12,799	17,249	19,065	22,950	30,400	37,000	44,550
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES							
All levels	99,411	132,776	147,928	188,600	265,500	337,300	418,650
Lower division	90,528	119,698	137,700	175,400	246,800	313,400	388,500
~~Upper division~~							
~~Graduate~~							
Special	8,883	13,078	10,228	13,200	18,700	23,900	30,150
STATE COLLEGES							
All levels	52,802	71,171	80,091	108,800	202,100	301,100	377,900
Lower division	16,395	19,478	22,170	31,700	57,650	84,250	105,700
Upper division	17,767	24,173	26,047	32,950	59,850	92,700	119,950
Graduate	3,126	3,572	4,272	5,600	10,350	15,200	19,700
Special	252	384	144	250	250	250	250
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA							
All levels	38,167	42,087	43,547	50,900	77,850	107,300	137,550
Lower division	13,116	13,451	14,030	18,350	27,150	35,950	45,900
Upper division	14,970	16,608	16,149	17,350	27,850	39,000	50,450
Graduate	9,631	11,566	12,922	14,700	22,000	31,100	39,650
Special	450	462	446	500	850	1,250	1,550
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES							
All levels	28,394	33,492	37,184	42,850	53,500	62,600	68,950
Lower division	14,357	16,676	17,206	19,800	24,500	28,750	31,600
Upper division	8,781	10,362	10,829	12,350	15,200	17,800	19,450
Graduate	2,589	3,546	3,338	4,200	5,800	7,150	8,100
Special	2,667	2,908	5,811	6,500	8,000	8,900	9,800
INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES							
All levels	25,247	26,199	27,436	28,500	29,950	31,500	33,000
Lower division	6,936	6,352	6,168	6,350	6,500	6,700	6,900
Upper division	7,239	8,128	8,353	8,500	8,850	9,050	9,300
Graduate	10,525	11,302	10,479	11,100	12,000	13,050	14,000
Special	547	417	2,436	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800

Work Table TC2. SUMMARY OF FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT OF CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN SURVEY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, TO 1975

State economic area and category	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL INSTITUTIONS							
All levels	182,624	208,398	225,615	276,600	405,100	536,800	661,350
Lower division	116,573	131,104	144,080	183,100	264,450	342,000	418,250
Upper division	45,465	54,331	55,024	63,250	97,650	137,500	172,300
Graduate	18,722	20,981	22,246	25,700	37,250	50,600	63,000
Special	1,864	1,982	4,265	4,550	5,750	6,700	7,800
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES							
All levels	70,165	80,916	91,162	115,750	162,600	205,200	251,400
Lower division	68,897	79,352	89,206	113,450	159,350	201,100	246,350
~~Upper division~~							
~~Graduate~~							
Special	1,268	1,564	1,956	2,300	3,250	4,100	5,050
STATE COLLEGES							
All levels	33,910	41,479	44,528	58,600	104,950	157,150	200,000
Lower division	15,596	18,010	20,052	28,000	50,350	73,350	91,750
Upper division	16,005	20,934	21,701	27,200	48,300	74,600	96,300
Graduate	2,141	2,305	2,681	3,400	6,300	9,200	11,950
Special	168	230	94	-	-	-	-
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA							
All levels	37,717	41,625	43,101	50,400	77,000	106,050	136,000
Lower division	13,116	13,451	14,030	18,350	27,150	35,950	45,900
Upper division	14,970	16,608	16,149	17,350	27,850	39,000	50,450
Graduate	9,631	11,566	12,922	14,700	22,000	31,100	39,650
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES							
All levels	21,625	24,630	26,801	30,950	38,550	45,400	49,900
Lower division	12,179	14,020	14,766	17,100	21,250	25,050	27,500
Upper division	7,838	9,004	9,520	10,850	13,400	15,650	17,100
Graduate	1,544	1,531	1,851	2,300	3,050	3,800	4,300
Special	64	75	664	700	850	900	1,000
INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES							
All levels	19,207	19,748	20,023	20,900	22,000	23,000	24,050
Lower division	6,785	6,271	6,026	6,200	6,350	6,550	6,750
Upper division	6,652	7,785	7,654	7,850	8,100	8,250	8,450
Graduate	5,406	5,579	4,792	5,300	5,900	6,500	7,100
Special	364	113	1,551	1,550	1,650	1,700	1,750

Work Table TC3. SUMMARY OF FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF PART-TIME ENROLLMENT OF CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING INCLUDED IN THE MASTER PLAN SURVEY, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, TO 1975

State economic area and category	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL INSTITUTIONS							
All levels	61,397	97,327	110,571	143,050	223,800	303,000	374,700
Lower division	24,759	44,551	53,194	68,500	98,150	127,050	160,350
Upper division	3,292	4,940	6,354	7,950	14,100	21,050	26,850
Graduate	7,149	9,005	8,765	9,900	12,900	15,900	18,450
Special	10,935	15,267	14,800	18,400	24,650	30,300	36,750
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES							
All levels	29,246	51,860	56,766	72,850	102,900	132,100	167,250
Lower division	21,631	40,346	48,494	61,950	87,450	112,300	142,150
~~Upper division~~							
~~Graduate~~							
Special	7,615	11,514	8,272	10,900	15,450	19,800	25,100
STATE COLLEGES							
All levels	18,892	29,692	35,563	50,200	97,150	143,950	177,900
Lower division	799	1,468	2,118	3,700	7,300	10,900	13,950
Upper division	1,762	3,239	4,346	5,750	11,550	18,100	23,650
Graduate	985	1,267	1,591	2,200	4,050	6,000	7,750
Special	84	154	50	250	250	250	250
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA							
Special	450	462	446	500	850	1,250	1,550
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES							
All levels	6,769	8,862	10,383	11,900	14,950	17,200	19,050
Lower division	2,178	2,656	2,440	2,700	3,250	3,700	4,100
Upper division	943	1,358	1,309	1,500	1,800	2,150	2,350
Graduate	1,045	2,015	1,487	1,900	2,750	3,350	3,800
Special	2,603	2,833	5,147	5,800	7,150	8,000	8,800
INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES							
All levels	6,040	6,451	7,413	7,600	7,950	8,500	8,950
Lower division	151	81	142	150	150	150	150
Upper division	587	343	699	700	750	800	850
Graduate	5,119	5,723	5,687	5,800	6,100	6,550	6,900
Special	183	304	885	950	950	1,000	1,050

Work Table JC1. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL ENROLLMENT, FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, TO 1975

CATEGORY	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
TOTAL							
All levels	99,411	132,776	147,928	188,600	265,500	337,300	418,650
Lower division	90,528	119,698	137,700	175,400	246,800	313,400	388,500
Special	8,883	13,078	10,228	13,200	18,700	23,900	30,150
FULL-TIME							
All levels	70,165	80,916	91,162	115,750	162,600	205,200	251,400
Lower division	68,897	79,352	89,206	113,450	159,350	201,100	246,350
Special	1,268	1,564	1,956	2,300	3,250	4,100	5,050
PART-TIME							
All levels	29,246	51,860	56,766	72,850	102,900	132,100	167,250
Lower division	21,631	40,346	48,494	61,950	87,450	112,300	142,150
Special	7,615	11,514	8,272	10,900	15,450	19,800	25,100

Work Table JC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL JUNIOR COLLEGES							
All levels	70,165	80,916	91,162	115,750	162,600	205,200	251,400
Lower division	68,897	79,352	89,206	113,450	159,350	201,100	246,350
Special	1,268	1,564	1,956	2,300	3,250	4,100	5,050
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
Lower division	1,582	1,670	1,749	2,200	3,200	3,750	4,400
SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
Lower division	1,594	1,807	2,101	2,650	3,600	4,250	5,150
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	669	702	801	1,000	1,250	1,400	1,400
SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	1,397	1,384	1,688	1,950	2,200	1,800	1,750
SEA 6, SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	1,371	1,405	1,596	1,650	1,700	1,650	1,450
SEA 7, SOUTH COASTAL AREA							
Lower division	946	1,095	1,199	1,500	2,050	2,500	2,550
SEA 8, IMPERIAL VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	203	222	240	250	300	300	300
SEA 9, SIERRA AREA							
Lower division	1,331	1,441	1,563	2,300	2,900	3,150	3,300
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	11,289	12,021	13,250	16,550	22,950	25,950	27,250
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	1,517	1,800	2,173	3,550	5,550	8,500	11,750
SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	1,774	2,543	3,142	3,400	5,650	7,450	9,000

Work Table JC 2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	1,223	1,385	1,722	1,650	2,150	2,300	2,150
SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	1,738	2,286	2,881	3,700	4,500	5,300	5,350
SEA F, LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	34,217	40,048	43,935	57,000	80,400	104,900	135,100
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	2,103	2,572	3,189	4,050	6,850	9,100	11,100
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO - RIVERSIDE - ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	3,520	4,319	5,051	6,550	9,700	13,750	19,300
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	587	646	715	850	1,150	1,450	1,450
SEA K, BAKERSFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	1,836	2,006	2,211	2,650	3,250	3,600	3,600

Note: Special students not distributed by SEA of location.

Work Table JC3. FIRST RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL JUNIOR COLLEGES							
All levels	29,246	51,860	56,766	72,850	102,900	132,100	167,250
Lower division	21,631	40,346	48,494	61,950	87,450	112,300	142,150
Special	7,615	11,514	8,2[illegible]2	10,900	15,450	19,800	25,100
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
Lower division	-	-	225	350	450	550	600
SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
Lower division	87	134	216	700	850	1,050	1,350
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	38	162	232	250	300	350	350
SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	249	540	682	800	900	800	750
SEA 6, SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	99	39	33	50	50	50	50
SEA 7, SOUTH COASTAL AREA							
Lower division	343	2,124	2,365	2,950	3,950	4,900	5,000
SEA 8, IMPERIAL VALLEY AREA							
Lower division	34	85	122	100	100	150	100
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO - OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	2,484	3,457	4,942	5,550	7,500	8,450	8,550
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	537	751	1,071	1,900	2,800	4,300	6,050
SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	893	1,056	993	1,500	2,450	3,200	3,850

Work Table JC3. FIRST RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	209	97	217	250	300	350	300
SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	220	917	1,542	1,800	2,150	2,500	2,550
SEA F, LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	13,923	22,003	26,453	34,400	48,200	62,700	80,700
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	1,443	2,237	2,995	3,650	6,100	7,150	10,000
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO - RIVERSIDE - ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	685	5,961	5,526	6,500	9,900	14,100	20,150
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	184	378	300	450	600	700	750
SEA K, BAKERSFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA							
Lower division	150	301	358	450	500	600	600

Note: Special students not distributed by SEA of location.

Work Table SC1. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL ENROLLMENT, FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME, BY CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

CATEGORY AND CLASS LEVEL	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
TOTAL							
All levels	52,802	71,171	80,091	108,800	202,100	301,100	377,900
Lower division	16,395	19,478	22,170	31,700	57,650	84,250	105,700
Upper division	17,767	24,173	26,047	32,950	59,850	92,700	119,950
Graduate	3,126	3,572	4,272	5,600	10,350	15,200	19,700
Special	252	384	144	250	250	250	250
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300
FULL-TIME							
All levels	33,910	41,479	44,528	58,600	104,950	157,150	200,000
Lower division	15,596	18,010	20,052	28,000	50,350	73,350	91,750
Upper division	16,005	20,934	21,701	27,200	48,300	74,600	96,300
Graduate	2,141	2,305	2,681	3,400	6,300	9,200	11,950
Special	168	230	94	-	-	-	-
PART-TIME							
All levels	18,892	29,692	35,563	50,200	97,150	143,950	177,900
Lower division	799	1,468	2,118	3,700	7,300	10,900	13,950
Upper division	1,762	3,239	4,346	5,750	11,550	18,100	23,650
Graduate	985	1,267	1,591	2,200	4,050	6,000	7,750
Special	84	154	50	250	250	250	250
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300

Work Table SC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL STATE COLLEGES							
All levels	33,910	41,479	44,528	58,600	104,950	157,150	200,000
Lower division	15,596	18,010	20,052	28,000	50,350	73,350	91,750
Upper division	16,005	20,934	21,701	27,200	48,300	74,600	96,300
Graduate	2,141	2,305	2,681	3,400	6,300	9,200	11,950
Special	168	230	94	-	-	-	-
SEA 1, NORTH COASTAL AREA							
HUMBOLDT							
All levels	1,039	1,240	1,397	1,750	2,450	3,400	4,300
Lower division	734	785	892	1,050	1,400	1,850	2,250
Upper division	271	413	471	650	900	1,350	1,800
Graduate	23	35	33	50	150	200	250
Special	11	7	1	-	-	-	-
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
NORTH BAY							
All levels	-	-	-	-	450	1,650	2,500
Lower division	-	-	-	-	100	800	1,000
Upper division	-	-	-	-	300	800	1,350
Graduate	-	-	-	-	50	50	150
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
CAL POLY-SLO							
All levels	3,044	3,831	3,796	4,600	6,950	9,550	11,050
Lower division	1,784	2,097	2,544	2,550	3,900	5,100	5,700
Upper division	1,214	1,696	1,195	1,950	2,950	4,300	5,150
Graduate	46	38	46	100	100	150	200
Special	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA							
CHICO							
All levels	1,782	2,484	2,608	2,950	4,050	5,300	5,650
Lower division	1,101	1,436	1,436	1,700	2,250	2,650	2,800
Upper division	596	961	1,071	1,150	1,600	2,300	2,450
Graduate	85	86	101	100	200	350	400
Special	-	1	-	-	-	-	-

Work Table SC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA							
STANISLAUS CTY.							
All levels	-	-	-	-	550	1,750	2,350
Lower division	-	-	-	-	200	800	900
Upper division	-	-	-	-	300	900	1,300
Graduate	-	-	-	-	50	50	150
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
TOTAL							
All levels	4,435	5,024	5,250	5,900	8,050	12,950	16,250
Lower division	1,919	2,101	2,172	2,450	3,550	6,550	7,950
Upper division	1,929	2,278	2,376	2,650	3,450	5,200	6,800
Graduate	581	640	700	800	1,050	1,200	1,500
Special	6	5	2	-	-	-	-
ALAMEDA CTY.							
All levels	-	-	-	100	1,500	5,250	8,050
Lower division	-	-	-	-	700	3,250	4,450
Upper division	-	-	-	100	650	1,750	3,150
Graduate	-	-	-	-	150	250	450
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO							
All levels	4,435	5,024	5,250	5,800	6,550	7,700	8,200
Lower division	1,919	2,101	2,172	2,450	2,850	3,300	3,500
Upper division	1,929	2,278	2,376	2,550	2,800	3,450	3,650
Graduate	581	640	700	800	900	950	1,050
Special	6	5	2	-	-	-	-
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
SAN JOSE							
All levels	7,777	8,698	9,035	10,750	14,500	19,800	24,900
Lower division	3,890	4,059	4,274	5,400	7,450	10,150	12,850
Upper division	3,484	4,264	4,287	4,800	6,150	8,400	10,500
Graduate	403	375	474	550	900	1,250	1,550
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Work Table SC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location,	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
college and class level	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA							
SACRAMENTO							
All levels	1,923	2,484	2,709	3,150	4,550	6,100	7,250
Lower division	816	1,036	1,117	1,250	1,900	2,350	2,750
Upper division	983	1,317	1,452	1,750	2,400	3,350	4,000
Graduate	108	115	131	150	250	400	500
Special	16	16	9	-	-	-	-
SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA							
FRESNO							
All levels	3,939	4,286	4,358	4,900	6,400	8,100	8,500
Lower division	1,828	1,918	1,877	2,450	2,950	3,550	3,550
Upper division	1,984	2,224	2,292	2,250	3,150	4,100	4,400
Graduate	117	130	179	200	300	450	550
Special	10	14	10	-	-	-	-
SEA F, LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA							
TOTAL							
All levels	5,128	7,927	9,802	17,950	45,700	72,900	97,100
Lower division	1,019	1,974	3,146	7,500	20,800	31,800	42,300
Upper division	3,398	5,111	5,821	9,250	22,200	36,800	49,200
Graduate	586	666	778	1,200	2,700	4,300	5,600
Special	125	176	57	-	-	-	-
CAL POLY-KV							
All levels	377	729	1,101	2,150	5,450	10,500	15,700
Lower division	270	467	887	1,200	2,750	4,650	6,700
Upper division	102	260	210	950	2,450	5,400	8,300
Graduate	-	2	-	-	250	450	700
Special	5	-	4	-	-	-	-
LONG BEACH							
All levels	2,273	3,670	4,380	6,800	14,250	19,450	24,850
Lower division	749	1,388	1,912	3,100	5,800	7,950	10,300
Upper division	1,224	1,927	2,158	3,350	7,500	10,400	13,200
Graduate	216	236	264	350	950	1,100	1,350
Special	84	119	46	-	-	-	-

Work Table SC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
LOS ANGELES							
All levels	2,478	2,904	3,334	5,950	14,100	22,400	28,550
Lower division	-	-	65	1,650	6,300	9,550	12,350
Upper division	2,072	2,482	2,818	3,700	6,900	11,150	14,100
Graduate	370	374	451	600	900	1,700	2,100
Special	36	48	-	-	-	-	-
ORANGE COUNTY							
All levels	-	-	-	600	2,900	6,500	9,900
Lower division	-	-	-	-	1,400	2,900	4,200
Upper division	-	-	-	500	1,400	3,300	5,200
Graduate	-	-	-	100	100	300	500
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN FERNANDO							
All levels	-	624	987	2,450	9,000	14,050	18,100
Lower division	-	119	282	1,550	4,550	6,750	8,750
Upper division	-	442	635	750	3,950	6,550	8,400
Graduate	-	54	63	150	500	750	950
Special	-	9	7	-	-	-	-
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
SAN DIEGO							
All levels	4,843	5,505	5,573	6,650	11,300	15,650	20,150
Lower division	2,505	2,604	2,594	3,650	5,850	7,750	9,700
Upper division	2,146	2,670	2,736	2,750	4,900	7,100	9,350
Graduate	192	220	239	250	550	800	1,100
Special	-	11	4	-	-	-	-

Work Table SC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
ALL STATE COLLEGES							
All levels	18,892	29,692	35,563	50,200	97,150	143,950	177,900
Lower division	799	1,468	2,118	3,700	7,300	10,900	13,950
Upper division	1,762	3,239	4,346	5,750	11,550	18,100	23,650
Graduate	985	1,267	1,591	2,200	4,050	6,000	7,750
Special	84	154	50	250	250	250	250
Limited	15,262	23,564	27,458	38,300	74,000	108,700	132,300
SEA 1, NORTH COASTAL AREA							
HUMBOLDT							
All levels	212	344	478	550	750	1,100	1,450
Lower division	47	72	106	150	200	250	300
Upper division	17	39	51	50	100	150	200
Graduate	10	12	26	50	50	100	150
Special	-	2	1	-	-	-	-
Limited	138	219	294	300	400	600	800
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
NORTH BAY							
All levels	-	-	-	-	350	750	950
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	50	50
Upper division	-	-	-	-	50	100	150
Graduate	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	-	-	-	300	600	700
SEA 3, SOUTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
CAL POLY-SLO							
All levels	54	280	386	500	650	1,200	1,600
Lower division	16	57	90	100	150	200	250
Upper division	24	54	46	100	100	200	200
Graduate	14	4	6	-	-	-	-
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	165	244	300	400	800	1,150
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA							
CHICO							
All levels	406	550	740	800	1,150	1,500	1,600
Lower division	52	61	93	150	200	250	250
Upper division	28	32	55	50	100	100	150
Graduate	16	10	15	-	50	50	50
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	310	447	577	600	800	1,100	1,150

Work Table SC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA 5, NORTH SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AREA							
STANISLAUS CTY.							
All levels	-	-	-	-	350	750	900
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	50	50
Upper division	-	-	-	-	50	100	150
Graduate	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	-	-	-	300	600	650
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
TOTAL							
All levels	3,353	4,435	5,464	6,800	11,050	17,100	22,600
Lower division	187	285	369	450	650	1,250	1,500
Upper division	253	401	535	700	950	1,600	2,250
Graduate	195	246	332	450	650	750	950
Special	4	2	2	-	-	-	-
Limited	2,714	3,501	4,226	5,200	8,800	13,500	17,900
ALAMEDA CTY.							
All levels	-	-	-	550	3,550	7,950	12,350
Lower division	-	-	-	-	150	650	900
Upper division	-	-	-	50	250	750	1,350
Graduate	-	-	-	-	150	250	400
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	-	-	500	3,000	6,300	9,700
SAN FRANCISCO							
All levels	3,353	4,435	5,464	6,250	7,500	9,150	10,250
Lower division	187	285	369	450	500	600	600
Upper division	253	401	535	650	700	850	900
Graduate	195	246	332	450	500	500	550
Special	4	2	2	-	-	-	-
Limited	2,714	3,501	4,226	4,700	5,800	7,200	8,200
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
SAN JOSE							
All levels	1,636	3,213	3,898	4,850	7,350	11,050	13,900
Lower division	175	280	342	500	650	900	1,150
Upper division	140	287	459	550	700	950	1,150
Graduate	76	98	144	200	300	400	500
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	1,245	2,548	2,953	3,600	5,700	8,800	11,100

Work Table SC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall) 1955	1957	1958	Projected (fall) 1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA C, SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AREA							
SACRAMENTO							
All levels	2,280	3,225	3,660	4,350	6,200	8,450	10,050
Lower division	57	137	180	250	400	500	600
Upper division	109	246	286	350	500	700	850
Graduate	43	76	93	150	200	350	400
Special	-	13	2	-	-	-	-
Limited	2,071	2,753	3,099	3,600	5,100	6,900	8,200
SEA E, FRESNO METROPOLITAN AREA							
FRESNO							
All levels	933	1,437	1,615	1,750	2,400	3,000	3,250
Lower division	34	85	92	150	150	200	200
Upper division	59	166	214	250	350	450	500
Graduate	26	59	49	50	100	150	200
Special	14	6	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	800	1,121	1,260	1,300	1,800	2,200	2,350
SEA F, LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA							
TOTAL							
All levels	8,303	12,749	15,908	26,700	60,200	89,650	109,450
Lower division	92	206	497	1,450	4,100	6,150	8,250
Upper division	961	1,621	2,179	3,200	7,800	12,500	16,400
Graduate	530	652	776	1,100	2,350	3,650	4,650
Special	66	122	44	250	250	250	250
Limited	6,654	10,148	12,412	20,700	45,700	67,100	79,900
CAL POLY-KV							
All levels	-	69	108	300	950	1,850	3,150
Lower division	-	16	72	150	300	500	750
Upper division	-	9	12	50	200	400	600
Graduate	-	-	-	-	50	50	100
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	44	24	100	400	900	1,700
LONG BEACH							
All levels	2,908	4,300	4,921	7,600	15,050	20,250	24,100
Lower division	92	185	334	650	1,200	1,650	2,150
Upper division	249	526	701	1,100	2,500	3,450	4,400
Graduate	132	173	199	300	800	900	1,100
Special	66	60	39	150	150	150	150
Limited	2,369	3,356	3,648	5,400	10,400	14,100	16,300

Work Table SC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF COLLEGE LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, TO 1975

SEA of location, college and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
LOS ANGELES							
All levels	5,395	6,479	8,340	13,350	23,800	34,850	40,350
Lower division	-	-	54	350	1,350	2,000	2,600
Upper division	712	878	1,171	1,600	2,950	4,750	6,050
Graduate	398	388	468	600	900	1,700	2,100
Special	-	50	-	100	100	100	100
Limited	4,285	5,163	6,647	10,700	18,500	26,300	29,500
ORANGE COUNTY							
All levels	-	-	-	700	3,850	8,750	13,400
Lower division	-	-	-	-	300	600	900
Upper division	-	-	-	150	450	1,100	1,750
Graduate	-	-	-	50	100	250	400
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	-	-	500	3,000	6,800	10,350
SAN FERNANDO							
All levels	-	1,901	2,539	4,750	16,550	23,950	28,450
Lower division	-	5	37	300	950	1,400	1,850
Upper division	-	208	295	300	1,700	2,800	3,600
Graduate	-	91	109	150	500	750	950
Special	-	12	5	-	-	-	-
Limited	-	1,585	2,093	4,000	13,400	19,000	22,050
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
SAN DIEGO							
All levels	1,715	3,459	3,414	3,900	6,700	9,400	12,150
Lower division	139	285	349	500	800	1,100	1,350
Upper division	171	393	521	500	850	1,250	1,650
Graduate	75	110	150	200	350	550	750
Special	-	9	1	-	-	-	-
Limited	1,330	2,662	2,393	2,700	4,700	6,500	8,400

Work Table UC1. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL ENROLLMENT BY CLASS LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

CLASS LEVEL	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
All levels	38,167	42,087	43,547	50,900	77,850	107,300	137,550
Lower division	13,116	13,451	14,030	18,350	27,150	35,950	45,900
Upper division	14,970	16,608	16,149	17,350	27,850	39,000	50,450
Graduate	9,631	11,566	12,922	14,700	22,000	31,100	39,650
Special	450	462	446	500	850	1,250	1,550

Note: This table summarizes more detailed data shown in Tables UC2 and UC3, relating to graded and special enrollments.

Discrepancies between recorded enrollments shown and other sources may result from a number of factors, including the fact that these totals have not been adjusted for duplicate listings.

Work Table UC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTION OF FALL GRADED ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF CAMPUS LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
THE STATE							
All Campuses:							
All levels	37,717	41,625	43,101	50,400	77,000	106,050	136,000
Lower division	13,116	13,451	14,030	18,350	27,150	35,950	45,900
Upper division	14,970	16,608	16,149	17,350	27,850	39,000	50,450
Graduate	9,631	11,566	12,922	14,700	22,000	31,100	39,650
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA							
Davis:							
All levels	1,907	2,283	2,341	2,900	4,700	6,350	7,750
Lower division	963	1,081	1,039	1,300	2,000	2,400	2,800
Upper division	539	730	756	950	1,700	2,400	2,750
Graduate	405	472	546	650	1,000	1,550	2,200
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
Total:							
All levels	18,245	20,127	20,732	23,500	33,150	41,450	46,550
Lower division	6,058	6,292	6,551	8,200	11,550	13,150	14,500
Upper division	6,749	7,239	6,937	7,150	10,550	13,650	14,450
Graduate	5,438	6,596	7,244	8,150	11,050	14,650	17,600
Berkeley:							
All levels	16,964	18,760	19,198	21,900	31,150	39,150	43,950
Lower division	6,058	6,292	6,551	8,200	11,550	13,150	14,500
Upper division	6,749	7,239	6,937	7,150	10,550	13,650	14,450
Graduate	4,157	5,229	5,710	6,550	9,050	12,350	15,000
San Francisco:							
All levels	1,281	1,367	1,534	1,600	2,000	2,300	2,600
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	1,281	1,367	1,534	1,600	2,000	2,300	2,600
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
South Central Coast:							
All levels	-	-	-	-	950	4,000	8,550
Lower division	-	-	-	-	500	1,950	3,550
Upper division	-	-	-	-	350	1,550	3,700
Graduate	-	-	-	-	100	500	1,300
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA							
Total:							
All levels	14,827	15,873	16,274	18,150	28,450	39,600	52,550
Lower division	4,588	4,336	4,354	5,550	8,300	11,600	15,600
Upper division	6,561	7,165	6,924	6,850	11,000	15,200	20,650
Graduate	3,678	4,372	4,996	5,750	9,150	12,800	16,300

Work Table UC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTION OF FALL GRADED ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF CAMPUS LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
Los Angeles:							
All levels	14,392	15,307	15,673	17,550	25,450	28,700	33,300
Lower division	4,588	4,336	4,354	5,550	7,400	6,950	8,500
Upper division	6,561	7,165	6,924	6,850	10,600	11,650	12,800
Graduate	3,243	3,806	4,395	5,150	7,450	10,100	12,000
Los Angeles Medical Center:							
All levels	435	566	601	600	1,600	1,900	2,300
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	435	566	601	600	1,600	1,900	2,300
Southeast Los Angeles:							
All levels	-	-	-	-	1,400	9,000	16,950
Lower division	-	-	-	-	900	4,650	7,100
Upper division	-	-	-	-	400	3,550	7,850
Graduate	-	-	-	-	100	800	2,000
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Total:							
All levels	29	42	53	50	750	1,600	3,650
Lower division	-	-	-	-	100	650	1,550
Upper division	-	-	-	-	350	550	1,450
Graduate	29	42	53	50	300	400	650
La Jolla:							
All levels	-	-	-	-	650	1,500	3,550
Lower division	-	-	-	-	100	650	1,550
Upper division	-	-	-	-	350	550	1,450
Graduate	-	-	-	-	200	300	550
La Jolla (Oceanography):							
All levels	29	42	53	50	100	100	100
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	29	42	53	50	100	100	100
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Riverside:							
All levels	692	821	991	2,000	3,200	5,000	7,050
Lower division	413	420	536	1,100	1,550	2,150	2,950
Upper division	274	396	452	900	1,550	2,350	3,400
Graduate	5	5	3	-	100	500	700
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA							
Santa Barbara:							
All levels	2,017	2,479	2,710	3,800	5,800	8,050	9,900

Work Table UC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTION OF FALL GRADED ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF CAMPUS LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
Lower division	1,094	1,322	1,550	2,200	3,150	4,050	4,950
Upper division	847	1,078	1,080	1,500	2,350	3,300	4,050
Graduate	76	79	80	100	300	700	900

Work Table UC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL SPECIAL ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF CAMPUS LOCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
THE STATE							
All Campuses	450	462	446	500	850	1,250	1,550
SEA 4, SACRAMENTO VALLEY AREA							
Davis	21	85	110	100	200	300	350
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
Berkeley	213	191	150	200	300	400	500
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
South Central Coast	-	-	-	-	-	50	100
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA							
Los Angeles	194	163	159	200	250	300	350
Southeast Los Angeles	-	-	-	-	-	100	150
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
La Jolla	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
Riverside	18	22	15	-	50	50	50
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA							
Santa Barbara	4	1	12	-	50	50	50

Note: Following campuses involve no special students or less than 25 special students: La Jolla (I.O.); Los Angeles Medical Center; San Francisco.

Figures include students reported as "special" or "limited" at the undergraduate level.

Work Table IC1. FIRST-RUN "STATUS-QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL ENROLLMENT, FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME, BY CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

CATEGORY AND CLASS LEVEL	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
TOTAL							
All levels	28,394	33,492	37,184	42,850	53,500	62,600	68,950
Lower division	14,357	16,676	17,206	19,800	24,500	28,750	31,600
Upper division	8,781	10,362	10,829	12,350	15,200	17,800	19,450
Graduate	2,589	3,546	3,338	4,200	5,800	7,150	8,100
Special	2,667	2,908	5,811	6,500	8,000	8,900	9,800
FULL-TIME							
All levels	21,625	24,630	26,801	30,950	38,550	45,400	49,900
Lower division	12,179	14,020	14,766	17,100	21,250	25,050	27,500
Upper division	7,838	9,004	9,520	10,850	13,400	15,650	17,100
Graduate	1,544	1,531	1,851	2,300	3,050	3,800	4,300
Special	64	75	664	700	850	900	1,000
PART-TIME							
All levels	6,769	8,862	10,383	11,900	14,950	17,200	19,050
Lower division	2,178	2,656	2,440	2,700	3,250	3,700	4,100
Upper division	943	1,358	1,309	1,500	1,800	2,150	2,350
Graduate	1,045	2,015	1,487	1,900	2,750	3,350	3,800
Special	2,603	2,833	5,147	5,800	7,150	8,000	8,800

Work Table IC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	648	630	643	825	850	1,600	1,625
Lower division	442	414	418	525	550	1,050	1,075
Upper division	193	200	203	250	250	500	500
Graduate	13	16	19	50	50	50	50
Special	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
SEA 7, SOUTH CENTRAL AREA							
FULL-TIME (No part-time)							
All levels	124	149	261	300	325	325	350
Lower division	64	88	97	100	125	125	150
Upper division	60	61	69	100	100	100	100
Graduate	-	-	95	100	100	100	100
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA 9, SIERRA AREA							
FULL-TIME (No part-time)							
All levels	14	19	23	25	25	25	25
Lower division	5	16	23	25	25	25	25
Upper division	9	3	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	6,253	7,570	7,880	8,700	10,350	11,300	12,200
Lower division	3,439	4,233	4,085	4,500	5,300	5,700	6,100
Upper division	2,035	2,427	2,474	2,700	3,200	3,450	3,700
Graduate	720	859	858	1,000	1,250	1,500	1,700
Special	59	51	463	500	600	650	700
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	1,052	1,187	1,316	1,500	2,000	2,550	3,000
Lower division	557	607	610	700	900	1,150	1,350
Upper division	429	464	453	500	700	850	1,000
Graduate	66	116	235	300	400	550	650
Special	-	-	18	-	-	-	-
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	-	99	128	150	150	150	200
Lower division	-	96	95	100	100	100	150
Upper division	-	2	26	50	50	50	50
Graduate	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Special	-	-	7	-	-	-	-

Work Table IC2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA F, LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	11,280	12,260	13,435	14,750	18,900	21,850	23,950
Lower division	6,362	6,992	7,492	8,150	10,400	12,000	13,100
Upper division	4,212	4,757	5,179	5,650	7,200	8,300	9,050
Graduate	701	487	593	750	1,050	1,300	1,500
Special	5	24	171	200	250	250	300
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	168	535	793	2,150	3,000	4,100	4,550
Lower division	108	375	571	1,500	2,100	2,850	3,200
Upper division	59	160	220	600	800	1,100	1,200
Graduate	1	-	2	50	100	150	150
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	1,733	1,812	1,927	2,100	2,450	2,850	3,250
Lower division	980	978	1,109	1,200	1,400	1,600	1,850
Upper division	710	782	769	850	950	1,100	1,250
Graduate	43	52	48	50	100	150	150
Special	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA							
FULL-TIME							
All levels	353	369	395	450	500	650	750
Lower division	222	221	266	300	350	450	500
Upper division	131	148	127	150	150	200	250
Graduate	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Special	-	-	1	-	-	-	-

Work Table IC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA 2, NORTH CENTRAL COASTAL AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	119	212	186	200	200	500	500
Lower division	73	117	91	100	100	250	250
Upper division	24	54	38	50	50	100	100
Graduate	22	41	21	-	-	50	50
Special	-	-	36	50	50	100	100
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	4,081	4,237	4,495	4,950	5,900	6,450	6,950
Lower division	1,351	1,048	979	1,100	1,250	1,350	1,450
Upper division	451	634	371	400	450	500	550
Graduate	495	834	503	550	750	900	1,000
Special	1,784	1,721	2,642	2,900	3,450	3,700	3,950
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	228	269	318	400	500	600	750
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Special	228	262	318	400	500	600	750
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	-	288	403	450	450	500	550
Lower division	-	234	290	300	300	350	400
Upper division	-	33	49	50	50	50	50
Graduate	-	21	38	50	50	50	50
Special	-	-	26	50	50	50	50
SEA F, LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	1,868	3,333	4,307	4,850	6,350	7,300	8,050
Lower division	595	1,107	884	950	1,250	1,400	1,550
Upper division	331	487	721	800	1,000	1,150	1,250
Graduate	351	936	733	950	1,350	1,600	1,800
Special	591	803	1,969	2,150	2,750	3,150	3,450

Work Table IC3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
SEA G, SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	101	107	173	500	800	950	1,200
Lower division	48	38	33	100	150	150	200
Upper division	47	60	42	100	150	200	250
Graduate	6	9	34	150	250	300	400
Special	-	-	64	150	250	300	350
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	372	412	478	550	750	900	1,050
Lower division	111	112	154	150	200	200	250
Upper division	90	86	85	100	100	150	150
Graduate	171	170	156	200	350	450	500
Special	-	44	83	100	100	100	150
SEA J, SANTA BARBARA METROPOLITAN AREA							
PART-TIME							
All levels	-	4	23	-	-	-	-
Lower division	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
Graduate	-	1	2	-	-	-	-
Special	-	3	9	-	-	-	-

Work Table IU1. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL ENROLLMENT, FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME, BY CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES AND EQUIVALENT INSTITUTIONS, CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

CATEGORY AND CLASS LEVEL	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
TOTAL							
All levels	25,247	26,199	27,436	28,500	29,950	31,500	33,000
Lower division	6,936	6,352	6,168	6,350	6,500	6,700	6,900
Upper division	7,239	8,128	8,353	8,550	8,850	9,050	9,300
Graduate	10,525	11,302	10,479	11,100	12,000	13,050	14,000
Special	547	417	2,436	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800
FULL-TIME							
All levels	19,207	19,748	20,023	20,900	22,000	23,000	24,050
Lower division	6,785	6,271	6,026	6,200	6,350	6,550	6,750
Upper division	6,652	7,785	7,654	7,850	8,100	8,250	8,450
Graduate	5,406	5,579	4,792	5,300	5,900	6,500	7,100
Special	364	113	1,551	1,550	1,650	1,700	1,750
PART-TIME							
All levels	6,040	6,451	7,413	7,600	7,950	8,500	8,950
Lower division	151	81	142	150	150	150	150
Upper division	587	343	699	700	750	800	850
Graduate	5,119	5,723	5,687	5,800	6,100	6,550	6,900
Special	183	304	885	950	950	1,000	1,050

Work Table IU2. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES AND EQUIVALENT INSTITUTIONS, CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
THE STATE							
All levels	19,207	19,748	20,023	20,900	22,000	23,000	24,050
Lower division	6,785	6,271	6,026	6,200	6,350	6,550	6,750
Upper division	6,652	7,785	7,654	7,850	8,100	8,250	8,450
Graduate	5,406	5,579	4,792	5,300	5,900	6,500	7,100
Special	364	113	1,551	1,550	1,650	1,700	1,750
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	530	568	503	600	750	850	950
Lower division	87	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	39	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	381	561	489	600	750	850	950
Special	23	7	14	-	-	-	-
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	7,580	7,400	7,802	8,150	8,550	8,950	9,350
Lower division	3,383	2,735	2,641	2,650	2,650	2,650	2,650
Upper division	1,709	2,555	2,622	2,650	2,650	2,650	2,650
Graduate	2,264	2,110	2,539	2,850	3,250	3,650	4,050
Special	224	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	1,095	1,343	1,569	1,750	1,900	2,050	2,250
Lower division	502	663	754	850	900	1,000	1,100
Upper division	512	626	722	800	900	950	1,000
Graduate	81	54	86	100	100	100	150
Special	-	-	7	-	-	-	-
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	9,255	9,664	9,283	9,500	9,900	10,250	10,600
Lower division	2,813	2,873	2,631	2,700	2,800	2,900	3,000
Upper division	3,751	3,876	3,566	3,650	3,800	3,900	4,050
Graduate	2,614	2,809	1,602	1,650	1,700	1,800	1,850
Special	77	106	1,484	1,500	1,600	1,650	1,700
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	747	773	866	900	900	900	900
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	641	728	744	750	750	750	750
Graduate	66	45	76	100	100	100	100
Special	40	-	46	50	50	50	50

Work Table IU3. FIRST-RUN "STATUS QUO" PROJECTIONS OF FALL PART-TIME ENROLLMENT BY STATE ECONOMIC AREA OF LOCATION AND CLASS LEVEL, INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITIES AND EQUIVALENT INSTITUTIONS, CALIFORNIA, TO 1975

SEA of location, campus and class level	Reported (fall)			Projected (fall)			
	1955	1957	1958	1960	1965	1970	1975
THE STATE							
All levels	6,040	6,451	7,413	7,600	7,950	8,500	8,950
Lower division	151	81	142	150	150	150	150
Upper division	587	343	699	700	750	800	850
Graduate	5,119	5,723	5,687	5,800	6,100	6,550	6,900
Special	183	304	885	950	950	1,000	1,050
SEA A, SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	53	25	33	50	50	50	50
Lower division	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	48	23	33	50	50	50	50
Special	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
SEA B, SAN JOSE METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	743	983	603	650	750	850	950
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	743	983	603	650	750	850	950
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEA D, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	279	239	480	500	550	700	700
Lower division	11	8	5	-	-	-	-
Upper division	73	63	96	100	100	150	150
Graduate	195	168	243	250	300	350	350
Special	-	-	136	150	150	200	200
SEA F, LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	4,965	5,204	6,297	6,400	6,600	6,900	7,250
Lower division	135	73	137	150	150	150	150
Upper division	514	280	603	600	650	650	700
Graduate	4,133	4,549	4,808	4,850	5,000	5,300	5,550
Special	183	302	749	800	800	800	850
SEA H, SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE-ONTARIO METROPOLITAN AREA							
All levels	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lower division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Special	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix C

SOURCES OF DATA

Information on sources of enrollment data, with copies of questionnaires submitted to the public junior colleges and independent institutions.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

SOURCES OF DATA

The major published reports on enrollment used in preparing the basic tables were the annual tabulations issued by the Bureau of Education Research and the Division of State Colleges, Department of Education; the Office of the Registrar, Berkeley, University of California; and the United States Office of Education.

In addition, unpublished data from the Division of State Colleges, Department of Education, and from the Offices of Registrars at each campus of the University of California provided further detail on State college and University enrollments.

Questionnaires were sent to public junior colleges and independent institutions to supplement information on hand. Copies of these questionnaires are included to indicate the nature of the information requested.

ENROLLMENT DATA SURVEY OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES IN CALIFORNIA FOR THE MASTER PLAN STUDY REQUESTED BY ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 88
1959 REGULAR (GENERAL) SESSION

I. Reported enrollment:

	10/31/57		10/31/58	
Full-time	______		______	
Part-time	______		______	
Adult	______		______	
Total		______		______
Day enrollment	______		______	
ADA	______		______	
Extended Day enrollment	______		______	
ADA	______		______	
Total enrollment		______		______
ADA		______		______

II. Grade 13 analysis:

	10/31/57		10/31/58	
First-time a/	______		______	
Transfer b/	______		______	
Continuing c/	______		______	
Returning d/	______		______	
Total freshmen		______		______

Is any information available on the county or area of location of the high school of graduation of the first-time freshmen?
Yes ________ No ________

If copies of the material are available, please enclose a copy.

Form completed by ____________________

Position ____________________

Institution ____________________

Department of Finance
Financial and Population
Research Section
062659

Junior college form (cont.)

a/ A first-time freshman is a student enrolling in college for the first time; one who has no college credits at the time of admission. A high school graduate who attends a summer session for credits before enrolling in a regular session is still considered a first-time freshman at the time of the latter enrollment.

b/ A transfer is a student enrolling in a particular college for the first time, but one having college credits earned at some other college or colleges.

c/ A continuing student is one who was enrolled at the same college in the previous regular session.

d/ A returning student is one re-admitted after an absence of one or more regular sessions. A former student transferring to an institution after attendance at another college is classified as a returning student, not as a transfer.

SURVEY OF PRESENT AND PROJECTED ENROLLMENTS OF PRIVATE COLLEGIATE INSTITUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA FOR THE MASTER PLAN STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION REQUESTED BY ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 88
1959 REGULAR (GENERAL) SESSION

I. Fall 1958 enrollment as reported to the Bureau of Education Research, California State Department of Education.

Undergraduate

Full-time (12 or more units) ________

Part-time (fewer than 12 units) ________

Special students ________

Total undergraduate ________

Graduate

Full-time ________

Part-time ________

Total graduate ________

Total enrollment ________

II. Enrollment expectation to 1975:

	1960	1965	1970	1975
Undergraduate				
Graduate				
Total enrollment				

III. Do you anticipate changes in administrative policy that will substantially affect the present pattern and/or size of enrollment in the years ahead?

Yes ________ No ________

If yes, which direction will the changes take?

	Increase	Decrease
Full-time		
Part-time		
Graduate		
Total enrollment		

Comments: ____

____

Private college form (cont.)

IV. Do you have reasonably firm plans for physical expansion to 1975?

Yes ________ No ________

Comments: ____

____

____

V. This section is of utmost importance to our study and as much detail as possible is appreciated. If more detail than requested here is available, please indicate below.

Number of full-time freshmen entering as first-time a/ college students who were graduated from high schools located:

	Fall 1957	Fall 1958
In California	________	________
Out of State	________	________

Is any information available on the county or area of location of the high school of graduation of the freshmen originating in California? Yes ________ No ________

Number of full-time transfers b/ from collegiate institutions:

	Fall 1957	Fall 1958
Undergraduate	________	________
Graduate	________	________
Total enrollment	________	________

Is this information available by grade level and/or by type of institution of origin? Yes ________ No ________

a/ A first-time freshman is a student enrolling in college for the first time; one who has no college credits at the time of admission. A high school graduate who attends a summer session for credits before enrolling in a regular session is still considered a first-time freshman at the time of the latter enrollment.

b/ A transfer is a student enrolling in a particular college for the first time, but who has college credits earned at some other college or colleges.

Department of Finance
Financial and Population
Research Section
062659

Form completed by ________________

Position ________________

Institution ________________

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Appendix D

STATEMENT BY THE MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The report on Projections of Enrollment for California's Institutions of Higher Education was submitted to members of the advisory committee in June, 1960, with a request for their comments. The replies received were essentially favorable, with the exception of those from the representatives of the University. The following statement presents their alternative set of assumptions regarding future administrative procedures to be used by the University of California in activating the Master Plan recommendations.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

Appendix D

STATEMENT BY ROBERT S. JOHNSON AND DONOVAN E. SMITH, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

In the preceding report, the Department of Finance has explained the basis for the "modified" projections presented, as follows:

> "It soon became evident in the preparation of enrollment projections intended to reflect the effect of the Master Plan on the educational systems, and particularly on the individual institutions and campuses within them, that it was necessary to assume certain administrative policies to achieve the desired ratios. These assumed policies had to be reasonable representations of the type of policies which might be adopted by the responsible authorities of each segment. At the same time they should unite the three segments into a unified pattern of administrative action of the type likely to be used in achieving the objectives of the Master Plan. These two criteria should be applied in evaluating the specific assumptions described below, for the modified enrollment projections presented herein are meaningful only to the extent that their basic assumptions approximate future administrative decisions and actions."[1]

Obviously, the first condition of such assumptions is that they conform with and result in projections that fulfill the Master Plan recommendations approved by both the Board of Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education.

The Master Plan recommends, with the approval of both boards, that "the percentage of undergraduates in the lower division of both the state colleges and the University be gradually decreased ten percentage points below that existing in 1960 (estimated to be 51 per cent in both segments) by 1975."[2] However, the Department of Finance's projections for 1975 (see Table 8) show a University lower division enrollment that is only 36.9 per cent of its total undergraduate enrollment, and a state college lower division enrollment that is 40.0 per cent of total undergraduate enrollment.

---

[1] See page 14.

[2] Master Plan Survey Team, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-75, (Berkeley and Sacramento, 1960)p. 9.

Again, the Master Plan recommends, and both governing boards have agreed, "that the determination of the means by which this recommendation can best be carried out be the responsibility of the governing boards."[3] The Regents of the University of California have authorized the Academic Senate, subject to their approval, to determine the conditions for admission to the University. The Academic Senate has established a statewide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, operating under statewide rules, to administer the admissions program of the University on a statewide basis. A student is admitted to the entire University, not to one campus only.

However, contrary to the University's historic policy, the Department of Finance, in developing its "modified" projections, has assumed independently "that in their final form the recommendations of the Master Plan relating to enrollment control will have to be framed in terms of individual colleges and campuses, with system-wide totals given secondary place."[4] This assumption not only contravenes University policy; it is contrary to the Master Plan Team's instructions to base the modified projections upon the assumption "That the lower division proportion of the full-time undergraduate enrollment of the two public segments will be reduced gradually so that by 1975 it will be, for each segment, in the neighborhood of 41 per cent. *This would be, in each case, a system-wide average, not necessarily true for each campus* within the system."[5] (our italics).

More specifically, the Department has assumed "that the greatest restrictions will be placed on new facilities" and that lower division enrollments on new

---

[3] Master Plan Survey Team, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-75*, (Berkeley and Sacramento, 1960) p. 9.

[4] See page 30 of preceding report.

[5] Master Plan Survey Team, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

University campuses will be limited to 30 per cent of total undergraduate enrollments.[6] It then asserts that "enrollment at those large institutions where planning figure limits will apply involves the assumption that 1975 lower division students will comprise . . . 40 per cent of the undergraduates at two University campuses (Berkeley and Los Angeles)."[7] Then, although the University's historical policy is to admit and enroll all qualified students, subject only to the availability of facilities, the Department assumes that "students diverted from the new space-limited State College and University campuses will not be admitted even though space could be provided for them. To admit them would invalidate the basic goal of diversion to the junior college system."[8]

To summarize: the Master Plan, as approved by both the Regents and the State Board of Education, recommends and assumes that by 1975 the University will restrict its system-wide lower division enrollments so that they will constitute 41 per cent of undergraduate enrollments, but this will "not necessarily be true for each campus within the system." By contrast, the Department of Finance's "modified" projections derive from the assumption that, on each new campus, lower division enrollment will be limited to 30 per cent of total undergraduate enrollment, that at Berkeley and Los Angeles it will be limited to 40 per cent, while at Davis, Riverside, and Santa Barbara it will be less than 40 per cent. Obviously, to restrict lower division enrollment on each campus to 40 per cent or less of its undergraduate enrollment will not result in a system-wide lower division total that is 41 per cent of the system-wide undergraduate enrollment.

Assumptions that, in our judgment, would accord more closely with the Master Plan recommendations approved by both boards and, as far as possible within these recommendations, with the University of California's historical policies are that:

---

[6] See page 24 of preceding report.

[7] *Ibid*., pp. 24-25.

[8] *Ibid*.

1. Total lower division enrollment in the University will be managed so that, by 1975, it will constitute about 41 per cent of its total undergraduate enrollment.

2. This will be achieved by (a) a cooperative program by the University and secondary school administrators and counsellors to encourage larger proportions of high school graduates to attend the junior colleges first rather than to enter the University directly; and (b) modification of the University's Statewide admission requirements to the extent necessary to achieve the recommendations of the Master Plan, including those for restriction of lower division enrollment. Except for such modification of admission requirements, the University's acceptance of students will be on the same basis as at present.

3. When students who have been admitted to the University seek to register on a given campus in numbers exceeding its capacity, the University will arrange for them to attend another campus of their own choice that still has available facilities.

4. Lower division students diverted from the University system will have opportunity to complete their upper division studies by attending the institution of their original choice. (This repeats the Department of Finance assumption on the same subject, but, it should be made clear, "institution" refers to the statewide University and not to a single campus. The time will come when upper division, as well as lower division, students entering the University for the first time will have to be diverted from campuses at capacity to other University campuses having available facilities. It is assumed that the total "status quo" upper division and graduate enrollments for the University system will not be affected by this diversion.)

5. The University will provide facilities for the total number of upper

division students projected ("status quo") by the Department of Finance for 1975. (The "status quo" projections in Table 3 are 50,450. These differ from the Department's "modified" figure of 49,350 in Table 8. The difference of 1,100 students has, it would seem, resulted from a misunderstanding between the University and the Department of Finance as to the meaning of the "planning figures" submitted by the University and shown on Table 5. These were regarded by University officials as the optimum distribution of enrollments among its campuses, but not as the "limit" on each campus described in Assumption 7, page 21, of the Department's report. On repeated occasions, The Regents have expressed determination to provide facilities for all qualified students residing in this State who seek admission to the University. This determination has been modified only by their commitments to raise the admission requirements for entering freshmen and to restrict lower division enrollments in accordance with the recommendations of the Master Plan.)

6. The University will provide facilities for the numbers of graduate students projected ("status quo") by the Department of Finance for 1975. (The "status quo" projections in Table 3 are 39,650.)

Modified projections of University enrollments for 1975 based upon the foregoing assumptions would thus be: Graduate, 39,650; Upper Division, 50,450; Lower Division, 35,050; Total, 125,150. (The graduate and upper division enrollments are those projected "status quo" by the Department of Finance, as shown in Table 3 of the report; the lower division enrollment has been reduced to constitute 41 per cent of total undergraduate enrollment.)

The "modified" projections of University enrollments for 1975 based upon the University's policies, as described above, may thus be compared with the projections developed by the Department of Finance (see Tables 8, M-1) as follows:

	Projections Based on University Policies	Department of Finance Projections
Lower division	35,050	28,800
Upper division	50,450	49,350
Graduate division	39,650	40,600
TOTAL	125,150	118,750

In fact, the Department of Finance's "modified" projections do not satisfy one of the Department's own assumptions: that "the first administrative policy to be assumed is that, in diverting lower division students from the State colleges and the University, each system's status quo enrollment of such students will be reduced in the same proportion, so that each system's percentage of the two-system total remains unchanged."[9] This is shown in the following analysis of figures in Table 7 of the Department's report:

	Status Quo		Modified		Difference between Status Quo & Modified	
Segment	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	% (of S.Q.)
State Colleges	91,750	66.7%	67,400	70.1%	-24,350	-26.5%
Univ. of Calif.	45,900	33.3%	28,800	29.9%	-17,100	-37.3%
TOTAL	137,650	100.0%	96,200	100.0%	-41,750	-30.1%

Thus, according to the State Department of Finance projections, instead of reduction "in the same proportion", the lower division enrollments in the state colleges would be reduced by only 26.5 per cent from status quo and those in the University of California would be diminished by 37.3 per cent.

---

[9] See page 24 of preceding report.

REPLY

Carl M. Frisén, Department of Finance

Practically all of the differences between the original presentation of the modified projections for the University in Section IV of the technical report and the alternatives posed in the above statement center on these points:

1. The number of lower division students to be diverted to the public junior college system from the University and State college systems, and the procedure to be used in achieving the diversion.
2. The difference between admission to the University and enrollment at a University campus.

The Master Plan recommends greater use of the public junior college system in educating lower division students through diversion of these students from the University and State college systems. Two broad numerical measures of the volume of diversion are included: first, that the percentage of undergraduates in the lower division in each system be reduced by ten percentage points between 1960 and 1975 and, second, that this procedure (together with the raising of admission standards) should result in the diversion of about 50,000 lower division students to the public junior college system by 1975.[10]

It should be recognized, however, that no attempt had been made at the time of the selection and acceptance of these measures to determine whether a ten percentage point decrease would in fact result in a diversion of 40,000 students, or the new admission standards in a diversion of an additional 10,000 students. They are, therefore, interpreted as broad goals rather than rigid numerical standards. In preparing the modified projections it was assumed that both numerical measures should be taken into account and that if both could not be achieved the final projections should fall somewhere between.

---

[10] See pp. 13-14.

At the same time, there appeared to be one segment of lower division enrollment that could most readily be diverted to the junior college system. The application of planning limits to the "status quo" projections showed that by 1975 two University campuses and four State colleges would have excess enrollments which would have to be accommodated elsewhere. By applying controls at these very large institutions, lower division students could be diverted directly to the junior college system without disturbing enrollment patterns at the other campuses and colleges. As a result, it was assumed that all lower division students diverted from the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses of the University because of limitations on campus size would enroll in the public junior college system. The same assumption was applied to the State colleges that reached their planning-figure maximums. Under this assumption (combined with those involving higher admission standards), about 43,000 additional students are projected for the public junior colleges of California in 1975. In other words, diversion has not reached the 50,000 volume mentioned in the Master Plan, even though the University's proportion of undergraduates in the lower division has been reduced by more than ten percentage points. The University's proportion was cut more sharply than that of the State college system because the planning figure limits give the University a relatively greater excess lower division enrollment, which it is assumed can most readily be handled at the junior colleges as long as the number remains within the 50,000 total defined by the Master Plan.

In summary, if the ten percentage point reduction is the only criterion to be applied, the modified projections in the technical report are in error on that score. If the relationships between the three systems of public higher education are to be considered in terms of the Master Plan's numerical range of directed change and in terms of the impact of site and related limitations as spelled out in the planning figures, then the unilaterally developed University projections set forth in the above statement are not a satisfactory substitute for those in the technical report.

A second difference is pointed out in the University statement as follows:

> "The Regents of the University of California have authorized the Academic Senate, subject to their approval, to determine the conditions for admission to the University. The Academic Senate has established a statewide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, operating under statewide rules, to administer the admissions program of the University on a statewide basis. A student is admitted to the entire University, not to one campus only. However, contrary to the University's historic policy, the Department of Finance, in developing its 'modified' projections, has assumed independently 'that in their final form the recommendations of the Master Plan relating to enrollment control will have to be framed in terms of individual colleges and campuses, with system-wide totals given secondary place'."[11]

Perhaps this difference derives from the fact that a student is admitted to the entire University, but enrollment and particularly attendance are at a specific campus. Here an important assumption is made in the technical report: that once an undergraduate student is admitted to the University and enrolled at a specific campus he will be permitted to remain at that campus as an undergraduate as long as he wishes, subject only to maintenance of a satisfactory record. This means that system-wide policies relating to control of enrollment must meet limits defined by the specific enrollment patterns found at each campus. It is in this sense that the statement in the technical report becomes meaningful. Any number of system-wide policies regarding admission may be proposed, but they are useless unless they satisfy the standards imposed by an analysis which is a summation of individual campus experience and trends. If, as the University statement says, this "contravenes University policy", it may be assumed that the University will shift students from one campus to another at any point in their undergraduate program on the basis that they are both admitted to and enrolled in a University system and have no claim to any individual campus.

---

[11] See page 94.

Perhaps the most important contribution of the University statement is that it provides projected enrollment within one system and passes judgment essentially on the basis that a larger enrollment is preferable to a smaller enrollment within that system. But it does not concede that the determination of whether a larger enrollment is desirable within the University system involves any consideration of the role of the public junior college system with relationship to the whole concept of the diversion process.

It would be exceedingly interesting to have similar types of statements from the State college and junior college systems, spelling out those policies, whether historic or proposed, that would result in unilaterally acceptable enrollment projections. A comparison of the three statements would do much to clarify for one limited area — that of enrollment modification and control — the difficulties that lie ahead in seeking to achieve, through the Master Plan, a coordinated and unified system of public higher education.